

AMERICA

A CATHOLIC REVIEW OF THE WEEK

VOL. XXXIV, No. 12
WHOLE No. 849

January 2, 1926

PRICE 10 CENTS
\$4.00 A YEAR

CONTENTS

	PAGE
CHRONICLE	267-270
EDITORIALS	
An Alarm and a Warning—The Unwritten Page—School Legislation in Washington— Muddled Masons—By Grace of Mr. Wheeler— Making Terms with Heresy	271-273
TOPICS OF INTEREST	
Big News from the West—The Catholic and the Newspapers—Catholic Foundations and Canon Law—O'Reilly, Bolshevik	274-280
POETRY	
I Shall Go Softly—The First Christmas Holidays	280; 284
EDUCATION	
The School Fight in Washington	281-282
SOCIOLOGY	
"Send Me to Sing Sing"	282-283
NOTE AND COMMENT	283-284
DRAMATICS	
Unclean Plays	285-286
REVIEWS	286-288
COMMUNICATIONS	289-290

Chronicle

Home News.—On December 22, it was made known at the White House that the President intends to accept the invitation of the League of Nations to take part in the preliminary meeting of

Disarmament the International Disarmament Conference called for February 15, 1926, at Geneva. Eighteen Governments will participate in this meeting. Certain questions, however, remain to be decided, such as whether Congress must be asked to appropriate funds for the expenses of the American delegates, and also as to the form, date and character of the answer to the invitation. It is hinted, also, that the President may not find it necessary to seek legislative approval, and that even the Congressional enemies of the League will not stand in the way. It is pointed out that this does not involve participation in the League, but is rather dealing with the League as a friendly outsider and equal. The delegation will undoubtedly go to Geneva with certain reservations, in particular with regard to naval reduction and the safeguarding of the Washington treaties.

It is a commonplace in the American press that the American people are paying Great Britain's debt to

the United States through an overcharge of several hundred million dollars a year on rubber, of which the British Empire holds a world monopoly. On

Rubber December 22, Secretary Hoover issued a statement, which was at the same time an attack, on what he calls the extortionate policy of the East India rubber combine, and a call for public cooperation in this country in bringing down the high figure of one dollar a pound on raw rubber. Mr. Hoover stated that the rubber combination is taking \$700,000,000 more than a fair price from the American public for the present year's rubber supply, and holds that the increase in price is purely artificial. The most practical suggestion he makes is the formation of a single purchasing agency for all American rubber buyers, and, at the same time, reduction of consumption by twenty-five per cent and the stimulation of new rubber production in other areas.

Austria.—With good reason the country is far from satisfied with what has been accomplished for it by the League of Nations. "Beautiful speeches were

**League
Futilities** delivered at its meetings," Dr. Seipel trenchantly remarks in an address before the Kulturbund, "many an important and serious issue was brought up for discussion at the sessions of its Commission, but we fail to see any results." He concluded that: "The ways of the League are not the paths that lead to a speedy understanding between nations." Austria, in fact, has been left in a most precarious position. A recent statement from Chancellor Reineck, just communicated to us, discloses the incredible situation that eighty-two per cent of the Government's entire revenue goes to its officials, either in service or pensioned. Such is the burden placed upon it by the pact of Geneva which has ordered all State employees of Austrian descent in the various so-called Succession States to be returned to Austria for their support. As an act of injustice and pure imbecility it would be difficult to surpass this ordinance. On the other hand there is little possibility of trade, owing to the commercial corruption existing on the part of Southern and South-Eastern neighbors of Austria in their relations with her. Practically nobody, we are credibly informed, ever thinks of paying for goods received from Austria. Here are two of the main difficulties confronting this unhappy country today.

On the other hand there are favorable symptoms of

a Catholic revival which has been very slow in coming. Encouraging results are being obtained by the Jesuits at work among the students and professors in the universities at Vienna and Innsbruck. Eminent university professors are mentioned who are now militantly Catholic. Acting Rector Rintelen of Innsbruck University sent a telegram of congratulation to the University of Paris on the occasion of its jubilee, which is without precedent in former days. The ravages of Socialism, of course, have been terrible in destroying the faith of the people.

American Catholics will also be particularly interested in the Catholic press meeting at Vienna, reported by the *Reichspost*. About the beginning of December the editor of the *Kölnische Volkszeitung* and the head of the Gorreshaus-Verlag, two leading Catholic publicists of Germany, spent several days in consultation with the staff of the Austrian Verein Herold in order to discuss the possibilities of a more perfect cooperation between the Catholic press enterprises in their respective countries. Dr. Seipel and Dr. Kienböck acted as chairmen of the first sessions. The Austrian Chancellor's presence is also mentioned at one of the meetings, indicating the importance attached to these events. The sessions are to be resumed, after a few weeks, in Berlin.

The Verein Herold is connected with the Herold stock company of Vienna which publishes the leading Catholic daily in Austria, the *Reichspost*, issued at Vienna. This daily is also the official organ of the Christian Social party. The newly established cooperation between the Catholic press of Vienna and Cologne will doubtless be of considerable importance for the Catholics of both Austria and Germany.

China.—Reports from Tokio state that on December 17 the first detachment of Japanese troops sent from Korea to Manchuria to assist in protecting foreigners during the Chinese factional fighting arrived in Mukden, the Manchurian capital and headquarters of Marshal Chang Tso-lin. The Governor was away at the head of his armies and it was understood that he had been notified that he would not be allowed to return to his capital unless as a complete victor. It was not likely the Japanese forces entering Manchuria would exceed the 15,000 permitted under the Portsmouth Treaty, made at the end of the Russo-Japanese War in 1905. Several hundred Chinese students held a mass meeting in Tokio protesting Japan's action.

The rival Chinese forces are reported heavily engaged at Hsin-Mun-fu, west of Mukden. A Peking dispatch to the London *Daily Express* states that Tientsin had been captured by General Feng and that the army of Li Chang-ling, Governor of Chihli, was in full retreat. Feng's troops entered Tientsin from the south after cutting the railway to Nanking. The railway to Hankow was also

reported cut and there was a rumor that in consequence of Feng's victory, Tuan Chi-jui, President of the Republic, would retire. The Nationalist victory is the more remarkable as it followed a serious defeat, despite Soviet assistance, on December 19 in the same territory. The casualties in the engagement were reported as 2,000 killed or wounded. The civil disorder almost paralyzes the Peking Government and prevents the organization of a new ministry.

France.—Premier Briand secured a more or less personal victory when the Chamber, December 20, after several days' debating, voted to adopt the Government's present Syrian policy, thus solving one of the most perplexing problems with which the new Cabinet had been confronted. The appearance, in the public gallery, during the debate, of General Sarraïl, whose conduct in the mandate territory had come in for scathing denunciation, provoked such tumult as to cause suspension of the session. M. Briand, in three of the most brilliant speeches of his career, ultimately succeeded in swerving the Chamber's interest to the present and future aspects of the Syrian administration, and was able to give a report of an encouraging outlook in the troubled territory, and of the popularity there of the new High Commissioner.

Less flattering to the new Government was the Chamber's vote, December 22, to suppress the training of all reservists during the coming year. M. Painlevé, Minister of War, had demanded credits sufficient to permit reorganization of the army. The vigorous opposition of the Left parties was voiced by Simon Reynaud, who declared that it would be shameful to spend 40,000,000 francs in training reservists only recently equipped by their war experience, at a time when the nation's finances can only be saved by economizing on every centime.

Through Captain Gordon Canning, his British emissary, Abd-el-Krim has shown fresh inclination to consider the terms of peace outlined by France and Spain last July.

Recognition of the spiritual sovereignty of the Sultan, a point stressed by the European allies, will afford no difficulty, if the autonomy guaranteed the Riff provides full administrative, political and economic independence. In the words of his English spokesman, the Riff chief looks for a status similar to that of Canada or other of the British dominions. He desires the French to be assured, moreover, that in his prosecution of war he has had no help whatever from either Berlin or Moscow.

Great Britain.—After sanctioning the action of the Government's representatives at Geneva in accepting the award of Mosul to Iraq by the League of Nations, conditioned on the renewal of the British-Iraq treaty for twenty-five years, the House of Commons adjourned until February 2. The final vote on Premier Baldwin's motion

Catholic Revival

Catholic Press Meeting

Japanese Occupy Mukden

Warfare

Approval of Syrian Policy

No Credits for Reservists

Overtures from the Riffians

Commons Accepts Mosul Award

stood 239 to 4. Both Mr. Baldwin and Mr. Amery, Great Britain's delegate to Geneva, eloquently defended the Government's policy against a spirited opposition from the Socialist and Laborite members. When, after two hours of obstructionist tactics, the Government finally proposed and carried cloture, the Labor irreconcilables walked out of the House in a body amid the jeers of the Conservatives. Their protest was made despite Mr. Baldwin's insistence that in asking for the unanimous support of the House approving the League's award, he had no wish to pledge it to the actual terms of the treaty which he hoped to negotiate with Iraq, assuring them with when Parliament convenes again, time would be given for its discussion. The day following the action of the House Mr. Baldwin and the Turkish ambassador held a conference in London and though the issue was not made public, the meeting was taken to signify that however reluctantly Turkey may accept the League's verdict, there was no apprehension that she was disposed to infringe it.

The General Council of the Trades Union Congress refused to endorse a resolution calling a conference, independently of the Amsterdam International Federation of

Trades Unions

Trade Unions, to work for the promotion of international unity among trade unionists, that would include Russian Communists. It will be recalled that last April representatives of British and Russian unions formed themselves into an Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee to work for the admission of the Russians to the Amsterdam Federation. At that time the British promised that if the Amsterdam Bureau refused to call a conference to which the Russians would be invited, they would convoke one. When the Amsterdam International met on December 5 the Continental unions opposed any conference with the Russians on the question of affiliation unless preceded by Russian repudiation of association with Communist propaganda. The British urged an unconditional meeting, if only to show the utter incompatibility of Communist unionism, as understood in Russia, with the unionism of other countries, but their proposal was defeated. Subsequently the Anglo-Russian Joint Advisory Committee held a closed meeting in Berlin and the resolution which the General Council of the Trades Union Congress has refused to endorse, was drawn up. The Council's action was taken to mean that the British unions had definitely turned away from a course which for some time past had seemed rather pro-Communist. But while refusing to call a conference on their own initiative they promised to use their mediatory influence to persuade the Amsterdam Bureau to change its views. However, there was not much likelihood of their succeeding.

The House of Commons has adopted a supplementary estimate of £9,000,000 for the coal mining subsidy, making a total of £19,000,000 voted. Mr. Churchill in moving

Coal Subsidy

the vote explained that ninety per cent of the subsidy had gone directly to wages. Anxiety about the position next May when the subsidy comes to an end is increasing for the industry shows no signs of improvement and the

Royal Commission is proceeding very slowly with its inquiry and apparently uncovering no new evidence. In the King's speech from the throne read before the adjournment of Parliament for the holidays he emphasized his anxious interest in the inquiry and urged ungrudging effort on the part of all concerned to find a solution for the problem.

The housing shortage which has continued serious ever since the armistice was recently brought to the front again by anti-Government members of the House. The Liberals

Housing Shortage

led in the attack maintaining that since the war only 344,000 houses had been erected instead of more than 1,000,000 needed, that there was a present shortage of at least 500,000 and that to this could be attributed much of the increase in disease, immorality and Communism in the nation. Premier Baldwin, far from seeking to refute the charge, admitted that the Government's housing plan, put into effect in Scotland, of fostering building by offering a bonus, had failed and added that it was decided to adopt an alternative method. In answering the Liberal's attack, one of the main reasons for the failure was attributed to the opposition of the trades unions.

Italy.—Formal approbation of the Washington debt agreement was given in the Chamber of Deputies, December 17, by a unanimous vote. In refutation of the idea,

Approval of Debt Terms

expressed in certain quarters, that the debt should have been canceled, Count Volpi assured the Deputies that "these critics forget that the American debt is a liability freely incurred by the Italian nation. It is, in other words, a debt of honor which we are bound to meet to the utmost of our capacity to pay." Adjourning for the Christmas holidays, on December 19, Parliament, after a session of one month, had accomplished an unusual program of legislative enactment. By the laws to which both Houses have given approval, the Government is promised protection against its Italian opponents abroad, the power of the Premier has been greatly increased, and a large part of local Government has been transferred to the central authorities through its "podesta" system.

Jugoslavia.—The malicious reports of an impending rupture between Jugoslavia and the Vatican have been finally refuted by M. Nintchitch's official statement. The

Relations with Vatican

Foreign Minister affirms that relations continue to be friendly. He further states that the divergence of opinion, concerning the administration of the Southern Slav Institute of St. Jerome in Rome, is of a juridical nature, to be settled by experts. Mgr. Pellegrinetti, Papal Nuncio at Belgrade, is likewise optimistic. In his capacity of Dean of the Diplomatic Corps, the Nuncio was spokesman for the foreign representatives on December 1, when they offered congratulations to King Alexander on the anniversary of the reunion of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes. Seniority of rank, reckoned by duration of office, belongs

in reality to the popular United States Minister, Mr. Dodge, in faithful contact with the King throughout and since the war; but he gracefully waived his position in favor of the distinguished ecclesiastic appointed by the Holy See to the Royal Court at Belgrade.

Meanwhile many problems occupy the Catholic Hierarchy, concerned with the material support of the Church as well as with the religious education of the people. In

**Catholic Position
Favorable**

their Joint Pastoral they express their satisfaction that the jubilee year was so faithfully observed, and that so many thousands responded to the call to visit the Eternal City. The Faithful are exhorted to persevere in their devotion to the Holy Catholic Faith and to resist all attempts to alienate them from the Truth—an allusion to Old Catholic propaganda. As this Pastoral caused annoyance in certain anti-clerical quarters the Minister of Public Worship has found it necessary to issue a statement to the Press that his relations with the Hierarchy remain cordial, and that there is no truth whatever in the malicious report that he had refused to see the Archbishop of Zagreb and his colleagues when they called on him at Belgrade. M. Trifunovitch expresses his regret that any credence should have been attached to an insinuation that he had been lacking in deference and courtesy to the representatives of the Catholic Church. It is of interest that Stepan Raditch, the Croat leader, who is now Minister of Education, has found it expedient not to pursue in all respects the anti-Catholic policy he had preached. He has re-established three Religious Training Colleges staffed by Sisters; and on the advice of his ministerial colleagues has paid an official visit to the Archbishop of Zagreb.

Latin-America.—On December 1, Señor Hernando Siles was elected President of Bolivia and Señor Abdon Saavedra, Vice President. Both were candidates of the

Bolivia

Republican party. No opposition was offered and the elections passed off quietly. The new Bolivian Minister to the Holy See, Señor Jorge Saenz, presented his credentials to the Vatican on October 30. Following an address on this occasion in which Señor Saenz expressed his gratitude for having been selected to represent the interests of Catholic Bolivia, he presented the Cardinal Secretary of State with the Gran Cruz del Cóndor de los Andes, an official decoration offered by the Bolivian Government. —Three more dioceses have recently been erected. The Internuncio Apostolic, Archbishop Trocchi, consecrated the new Bishops in the presence of the President and chief Government officials.—General business conditions in Bolivia continue steady with no perceptible change from month to month. Exchange averages 2.89 bolivianos to the dollar. The country's chief imports during November and December consisted largely of flour from the United States and Chile and sugar from the United States and Peru.

Changes in the Papal diplomatic appointments to three South American countries were announced from Rome

on December 17. Monsignor Beda Cardinale for three years Nuncio Apostolic to Argentina, has been named Nuncio to Brazil. He succeeds Cardinal Enrico Gasparri in

Brazil

that post.—The central and southern States of Brazil, Parana in particular, are expected to develop considerably in the next few years. Coffee is being extensively cultivated in the northern section of Paraná and an influx of German immigrants is forming colonies at various points. The Government's efforts to develop the cotton industry should also bear results and lead to a continued expansion of the domestic manufacturing industry.

In his allocution at the secret Consistory of December 14, the Pope made special mention of Mexico speaking of its deplorable state and the sad condition of the

Mexico

Church in that country. He praised the admirable zeal of the Mexican episcopate and clergy who are taking a firm stand against hostile attacks and irreligion. Notwithstanding the deep religious faith of the Mexican people who, the Holy Father said, surpass every eulogy which might be made of them, the only hope for a better future in Mexico is in a special intervention of Divine goodness and in harmonious and disciplined Catholic activity.—With the Tabasco situation unchanged a new source of trouble for the Church has developed in the proposal for a law regulating private benevolent institutions which *El Universal* reports will soon be presented before the National Legislature.—The Secretary of the Interior has ordered the application of the law forbidding priests of foreign nationality to exercise their ministry in Mexico.—A recent report from Mexico City states that since 1901 the Government's revenue from oil has amounted to over 2,193,000,000 pesos. The first ten months of 1925 produced nearly 98,000,000 barrels of oil worth about 250,000,000 pesos.

Next week, Eugene Weare will continue his series of papers on the preparations being made for the great Eucharistic Congress next June at Chicago. He will give some idea of the bigness of the plans.

An interesting contribution to the discussion on education and culture will be "Harvard Culture and Jesuit Humanism," by John LaFarge.

Mary Dixon Thayer's "An Octave of Children's Prayers," published in *AMERICA* for December 5, 1925, found favor with our readers as one of the finest features of recent months. It is with pleasure that we announce another page of graceful child-poems in next week's issue. A group of similar verses by Miss Thayer appeared in the *Saturday Evening Post* on December 12, 1925.

Attention is called to the announcement in the advertising pages of an important new series to begin soon.

AMERICA

A - CATHOLIC - REVIEW - OF - THE - WEEK

SATURDAY, JANUARY 2, 1926

Entered as second-class matter, April 15, 1909, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Acceptance for mailing at special rate of postage provided for in Section 1103, Act of October 3, 1917, authorized on June 29, 1918.

WILFRID PARSONS
Editor-in-Chief

JOSEPH HUSSLEIN PAUL L. BLAKELY FRANCIS X. TALBOT
WILLIAM I. LONERGAN PETER J. DOLIN
Associate Editors

GERALD C. TREACY, Business Manager

SUBSCRIPTIONS POSTPAID
United States 10 cents a copy; yearly, \$4.00
Canada, \$4.50 - - - - - Europe, \$5.00

Address:
Suite 4847, Grand Central Terminal, New York, N. Y., U. S. A.
Telephone: Murray Hill 1635
CABLE ADDRESS: CATHREVIEW

Stamps should be sent for the return of rejected manuscripts.

A copy of the Index for Volume XXXIII of AMERICA will be mailed to any subscriber on application to the publication office, Grand Central Terminal, New York City.

An Alarm and a Warning

AS this edition goes to press an ugly rumor is circulated referring to "a political deal to put the Curtis-Reed Federal education bill across." The details, which would tell a curious story, need not now be stated. Are guardians of our interests betraying them?

AMERICA does not trust politicians. No matter what the pretense under which they strive to hide chicanery and self-seeking, it will come to terms with none of them. Back in October, 1918, AMERICA began a campaign against the Smith-Towner bill that has lasted more than seven years, and is now fighting the Curtis-Reed Federal education bill.

AMERICA announces that it will continue this fight for seven years longer, if necessary. It will attack without quarter any bill which creates a Federal Secretary of Education.

This opposition is not based upon petty or partisan motives. AMERICA is convinced that a Federal Department of Education is unauthorized by the Constitution, and that its establishment would be the sure foundation of the most pernicious bureaucracy that ever destroyed a free government and enslaved a people.

For the information of all and sundry, AMERICA hereby serves notice that without fear or favor it proposes to fight the Curtis-Reed bill to the bitter end.

The Unwritten Page

LIKE a white and unwritten page the New Year begins to unfold before us. The pages of years past, the years that came so slowly and so rapidly wheeled down the passage that we call time, to eternity . . . where are they with their burden of fears and hopes and tears, of

deeds marred and deeds well done, of empty aspirations that never issued into an outward act?

They have served their purpose, we may hope. We must now number them with the things beyond recall; with the snows of January sparkling under frozen stars; with June's roses, now attar in a crystal vase; with the crisp leaves, brown and gold, swirling in November paths. Perhaps nothing now remains of them but memories that sear and cut, or that mercifully abide with us to counsel and console. We cling to what is past as the years creep on, and reach for the things that once were. Like little children we turn to look back, as with unwearied pace God's servant Time leads us on to our Father's house. We have traveled far and a starless night has fallen. When will the dawn come and with it the peace of God?

But it is not well to live with the ghosts of the past. Our God is a God of the present. Before Him time is not. With Him our past may be forgotten, and our existence be made in some sense like His, an ever-present now. We live in and for eternity when we live the duty of the present moment. So living, our past is in His hands and thus, safe; and as for the future, in whatever measure great or small it is meted to us, that will be secure. Time was, time is, but time for those who live in the present, will be changed into an eternity of happiness. God again gives us a New Year, a time for noble thoughts and nobler deeds; another chance, perhaps the last, to realize that the years of men are but a means to an end, and that end, God.

Slowly, surely, the page unfolds before us. May we write upon it a story of striving for whatsoever things are true and good, until our Father takes the pen from our tired fingers, and gives us rest!

School Legislation in Washington

WHEN will the battle for private rights in education come to an end? Put in another way, when will American fathers and mothers be freed from incessant attack upon their right to direct and control the education of their children? When the Supreme Court declared the Oregon law unconstitutional, it brought one vicious form of assault upon a natural right to an abrupt end. But the factions which sought the destruction of the private and, more specifically, of the Catholic parish school, by jailing parents who entrusted their children to its care, have now devised another means of attaining the same end. They have chosen the State of Washington as the field in which to try out their nefarious purpose.

One part of this campaign includes taxation of the private school. Yet these private institutions supply a real need, since they afford parents an opportunity to give their children precisely the education which they deem right and proper. As far as the public is concerned, such schools lift a burden from every community in which they exist. They have always been exempted from taxation in this country, not because of the religious creed which they might represent, but simply because by providing means of education they relieve the State of the necessity of founding and maintaining a larger number of

public schools. This exemption has been justified by the results. The proposal to tax them rests upon no sane principle of legislation, but is merely an attempt to close them, and thereby render practically impossible the exercise of a right declared by the Supreme Court to be a natural right guaranteed by the Constitution. Possibly a few schools might pay the tax by increasing the tuition fee, but this device would not be possible in the case of the Catholic schools.

As a special correspondent points out on another page, there is no "crisis in education" in the State of Washington. The private schools have submitted without demur to all regulations issued by the State and the local communities. Their teachers are certificated; the courses of study offered are at least equal in scope and educational worth to the courses prescribed for the public schools. They do not fear competition, nor do they resist inspection, either by State officials or by the public. But they do resent, as every educator in the public-school system itself rightly resents, an inspection which is not inspection but persecution.

One of the most dangerous forces operating in this country today is the attempt to secure uniformity in social activity, including education, through legislation, on the plea that otherwise the State cannot protect its interests. The truth is that this craze for standardization, which estimates schools, children and citizens alike as cogs and wheels in a machine, is destructive of the principles upon which the well-being of the State must rest. When to this craze is added a bigotry worthy of the Ku Klux Klan, the results must be indeed deplorable.

The citizens of Washington have defeated previous attacks on freedom in education. It is to be hoped that they will be equally successful in repelling this new strategy. Should they fail, the malicious bigotry which appeared at an end last June will again flame up, not only in Washington, but in other States.

Muddled Masons

THE issue of the *Supreme Council*, 33°, *Bulletin* for December 15 is almost entirely devoted to a panegyric of the new Curtis-Reed Federal Education bill. From the outset, this organ of the Masons of the Southern Jurisdiction has vied with the *Journal of the National Education Association* in urging the establishment of a Department of Education. Enlisting the aid of the editor of the *Journal*, Mr. Joy Elmer Morgan, the *Bulletin* sets before its readers in the issue referred to the chief reasons why the measure should be adopted by Congress.

These have been examined and refuted again and again in the pages of this Review, and their endless repetition by the *Journal* and the *Bulletin* arouses the suspicion that the promoters of Federal usurpation are running out of ammunition. Ultimately these alleged reasons rest on the theory that Congress is better fitted to meet the needs of the local schools than the people of the communities in which the schools are situated; or that a Department at Washington has some magic formula, unknown to educators at large, which will forthwith bring the schools to perfection. Each theory is a pure assumption. Proof that

it is correct has never been offered, possibly for the excellent reason that none exists.

It seems almost incredible, yet Mr. Morgan gravely asserts that a Department of Education is needed in order to teach the States how to build schoolhouses! Now it may or may not be true, as asserted by the National Committee on Schoolhouse Planning, quoted by the *Bulletin* that "the amount of waste in schoolhouse construction is enormous." But the scandalous waste, and worse than waste, the stupidity, inefficiency and corruption which marked the Government's conduct when it began to build hospitals and service schools for the war veterans, at once kills any lingering confidence that a group of bureaucrats at Washington could plan or would propose any effective or economical method of building public schools. The social and educational efforts of the Government, when cast in any sphere not strictly within the province of the Federal Government, invariably end in failure. Indeed, if the schools of the City of Washington be taken as a fair sample, it is impossible to sustain with any degree of gravity, the contention that Washington is a good schoolmaster even for its own children. In any case, Mr. Morgan could not have selected a better example of the abject dependence which could be forced on the States by a Federal Department of Education. Jefferson warned us that when we look to Washington to find out when to sow and when to reap, we shall soon want bread. Should any State or city fall so low in power of self-government as to ask Washington how to erect a schoolhouse, we may be sure that we shall soon lose not only a literate people but also a people capable of citizenship in a representative democracy.

Mr. Morgan and the Masons are badly muddled if they think that they advance the true prosperity of this country by advocating any plan which tends to replace local independence by submission to a Federal bureaucracy. A Secretary of Education with no other function than to sit as a member of the Cabinet and to direct the collecting of statistics, would be wholly out of keeping with the constitutional provision that the regulation of education within the States does not pertain to the Federal Government; but a Federal Secretary with the powers that will in the end be vested in him by partisans of Federal control would be intolerable. A proper concept of the constitutional balance between State and Federal authority demands that this peril be effectively averted by defeating any measure which proposes to create a Federal Department of Education.

By Grace of Mr. Wheeler

LET us breathe more easily, for it is decreed that the clergy may continue to offer the Holy Sacrifice without fear of violating the law of the land. In response to a question, Mr. Wayne Wheeler, counsel of the Anti-Saloon League, assures us that the use of wine for sacramental purposes is a constitutional right and not a concession of the Volstead act. If Mr. Wheeler does not take care he will one day succumb to a violent attack of magnanimity.

But while some of us believe that it is no business of

the Federal Government to interfere with this use, even by way of control, in this point the Federal Government is not with us. Yet the very Amendment which authorizes Congress to act at all in the premises is definitely limited. It prohibits the manufacture, transportation and sale of intoxicants for "beverage purposes." But an alcoholic liquor used in the commercial arts is certainly not a "beverage," nor is it a beverage when prescribed by a physician in the treatment of disease. In one case, it is a chemical; in the other a therapeutic agent. Neither is forbidden by the Amendment.

But where the Amendment stops short, Congress goes on. It alleges, apparently, that it *must* go beyond the Amendment to produce a document agreeable to the Anti-Saloon League and other non-constitutional and unconstitutional forms of government in this country. Hence almost daily, through one or other bureau, the Government issues some new restriction upon commercial and medical use, and in some cases the restriction is tantamount to total prohibition. All this simply means that what the Amendment itself does not forbid is banned either by the Volstead act or by some bureau or Department at Washington.

Doubtless Mr. Wheeler is wholly sincere in his statement that the use of wine for sacramental purposes is secured by a constitutional right, but the clergyman who made his pilgrimage to Rome last Summer, carrying by way of precaution a supply of Mass wine from the Middle West to the pier at New York, violated the Volstead law. That Congress has legislated on the subject, and that the procuring of sacramental wine is regulated and restrained by departmental rulings, is a matter of record. Whether these regulations are liberal or the reverse is beside the point. The simple fact is that sacramental wine, in no sense a "beverage," is made to fall under the Act. Furthermore, the violence accorded other constitutional rights by Congress, trial by jury, for instance, and freedom from search and seizure, is evidenced by the very text of the Volstead act. When one such right is destroyed or even impaired, it is well to keep a jealous eye upon those which remain. Mr. Wheeler is a man of power, but even granting that he intends to use this power with singular benevolence, it remains true that he is not eternal. His successor may ask, as other zealots have asked, why the law should be violated by a sect which protests that it needs a devil-created poison for its religious services.

Dr. Butler of Columbia, who believes that the Volstead act is both immoral and unreasonable, is certain that the act will be repealed or amended on the ground that in its present form it cannot be enforced. The report of Mrs. Mabel Willebrandt, assistant attorney general of the United States, bears out his contention that the situation is becoming worse. Mrs. Willebrandt writes that despite "the utmost endeavors" of the Federal officials, the number of cases pending in the courts increased from 22,380 on June 30, 1924, to 25,334 one year later. During the same period the number of cases filed rose from 46,431 to 54,688. The Government is asking \$33,800,000 for

enforcement next year, and the Methodists are asking that the army and navy be enlisted in the holy cause. Common sense would suggest repeal or amendment as a better way of putting an end to the crime and corruption which have thus far followed attempts to establish nationwide prohibition.

Making Terms With Heresy

WE can and do tolerate heretics. Not aware of the grossness of their error and enmeshed in the net of an ignorance truly invincible, they may be merely material heretics. But heresy is another matter. Catholics may not tolerate it, and for a very simple reason. The religion revealed by Almighty God and taught by the Church is truth. Heresy is falsehood.

There is not the slightest danger that Catholics in this or any other country are in danger of confounding intolerance of heresy with intolerance of heretics. Our gentleness with heretics is as sincere as our hatred toward heresy. In fact, the danger is that on plea of kindness and charity we may at times be tempted to extend toward the heresy the good will which should be strictly limited to the heretic. "The very sweetest and kindest parts of our nature are perpetually alluring us to an easy and indulgent view of that deadliest of all sins, the sin of heresy," wrote Father Faber years ago, "and thus to an acquiescence in that which ought, both morally and intellectually to be the most repulsive of all things to us, falsehood about God." The language may appear excessive, "deadliest of all sins," yet Father Faber, the gentlest of souls, was but repeating the doctrine of the Gospels. Whoever believes that the teaching of Our Lord as recorded by the Evangelists can be reconciled with any other conclusion than that heresy is "the deadliest of all sins" either has not read the Gospels, or has missed their meaning.

In some English-speaking countries a dangerous form of toleration of heresy appears to have arisen from the question sometimes referred to as "the reunion of the Roman and Anglican communions." The very phrasing is an error, since like truth and falsehood, the Catholic Church and the Anglican Establishment were never one, and never can be one. It is a false and harmful "charity" to minimize the fact, known to every Catholic, that none can enter into the Fold established by Jesus Christ who is not willing to submit without reserve to the rule and guidance of Christ's Vicar, the Bishop of Rome. Had this essential truth been grasped from the outset with the clearness which its importance merits, many a soul still feeding on the husks of ritualism and other formalities, would now be in the rich pastures to which the Shepherd of Christ's flock alone can lead. The truth need not be presented on every occasion in its most austere aspects, but nothing can release us from the obligation to speak the truth in its entirety as the Church presents it. Heresy, as Father Faber truly says, leading men to falsehood about Almighty God, is indeed "the deadliest of sins." We can never win acceptance for the truth, or save the world from its error, by "tolerating" sin.

Big News from the West

EUGENE WEARE

Special Correspondent for AMERICA

[The first of a series of papers telling the complete story of the preparations for the Eucharistic Congress.]

FROM the time to which the memory of this man runneth not to the contrary, it has been the fashion in our family to gaze, with wistful eyes, towards the wide, open spaces of the wild and woolly West. This thing has been a sort of family predilection. With us, little that is good ever came out of the East. Our lord and master had been native to the soil of the West of Ireland. In his manhood, after a stretch of curious activity which found no favor with the British Constabulary, he set sail for the lands to the West and took up his abode, with a group of his compatriots, west of the railroad tracks that had been set down on the west side of Manhattan Isle. Later, he took unto himself a wife from West Hoboken, near to where the Passionist Fathers now have their fine monastery. And when, years later, he died and was buried, it was found that much of the modest fortune he had accumulated had been made by way of the barter and sale of real estate in the up-and-coming community which goes by the name of West Philadelphia.

I mention all this in passing because I mean to suggest that I have, myself, this family weakness for the West and the things of the West. And yet, strange irony of fate, I have but infrequently ventured to indulge it, despite the fact that I have been something of a world rover. I have wandered far, to "the lands and the seas unknown," north, east and south but rarely to the West beyond the confines of West New York.

It was in thinking to correct this and thus to make amends that I ventured forth some days back. I was headed for the West but drew up sharply at Chicago and got no further. Now, whether you like it or no, it is almost impossible to travel east or west in this expansive land of ours without touching at Chicago. For Chicago, be it noted, is the world's greatest railroad center and, incidentally, its greatest stopping-off place. You touch at Chicago and then you stop off: there is no other way out. In my latest peregrination I did both and thereby hangs the tale I would tell.

I wish to observe at the outset that Chicago is a great city. It is a good deal more attractive than most cities of the world. It is quite a distinctive community, too, and, despite the chilling winds which blow eternally, either from lake or prairie, there is a warmth of hospitality ever present which is most comforting. I found among its people less of the studied artificiality which one encounters elsewhere and more of that ready frankness which is so wholesomely inviting. I reluctantly confess that I came down upon the city predisposed, like most New Yorkers who venture abroad, to scoff a bit; but I remained, if not

to pray, at least tremendously to admire much that I saw and heard.

In Chicago there is a group of Catholics numbering about a million and a half who have dreamed a great dream. Among these people the Faith is very active and alive and *energetic* and, under the guidance of a corps of priests, than whom there is no finer in all Christendom, they have set themselves to a huge task. For Chicago, next June, is to play the host to the Catholic world. The XXVIII International Eucharistic Congress is to be held in that city and, unless all the signs fail, the world will surely witness the most remarkable religious demonstration of a generation. When I was in Chicago recently they permitted me to see something of what is going on behind the scenes by way of preparation for the event. And that which I saw impressed me more deeply than anything I have observed in many years. These Chicago Catholics appear to have an aptitude for the doing of the big things in a big way and their undertaking in behalf of the Eucharistic Congress will surely result in a glorious triumph.

Now, in order to understand something of the task which these people have elected unto themselves it may be well to go back and review briefly the history of this movement which has its public manifestations in the Eucharistic Congresses. The readers of AMERICA need not be reminded that, from the earliest days of the Church, the Eucharist has been the central fact of Catholic worship. It is upon this doctrine of the Eucharist that the whole structure of the Faith has been built. The Living Presence of Jesus Christ in the Sacrament of the Altar may well be said to be the be-all and the end-all of Catholic devotion and practice. All else is but incidental. Little wonder is it, then, that in all the ages since Calvary, we find pious Christians ever ready and eager to manifest, to stimulate to increased fervor, spirited devotion to the Blessed Eucharist.

The Eucharistic Congresses are the latest manifestations of this eagerness to pay tribute, by public acts of adoration, to the sublime Mystery. And, because these Congresses have so pertinently appealed to the needs of our times, their growth and development have been little less than miraculous. The first of these, which was but a local, or diocesan, undertaking, was held at Lille, in France, in 1881, less than half a century back. Since then the movement has grown enormously and extended its influence to all parts of the world. Pious Catholics in many lands have vied with one another in their efforts to gather the Congress assembly within their own confines. Vienna, Paris and London, Amsterdam, Genoa and Rome itself, to mention but a few of the greater cities, have

proudly conducted their Eucharistic Congresses, with its steadily increasing impressiveness and mighty hosts of worshipers. Fifteen years ago the Congress was assembled at Montreal, in Canada, for the first Congress to be gathered together on the continent of North America. And now, for the first time, comes the Congress to the United States. For the first time, American Catholics, in the person of the Catholics of Chicago, will entertain the "Congressists" on the occasion of this glorious demonstration of faith.

This is why the Catholics of Chicago have so enthusiastically bestirred themselves. Theirs is the determination that nothing shall be left undone to make the forthcoming Congress, under American patronage, the most outstanding and attractive of all and well worthy our twenty millions. I know it to be a precarious undertaking but I am willing to risk the prediction that they shall not fail. Indeed, so extensive and detailed are the plans now under way that, were but half of these to be carried through successfully, the triumph is certain to be singularly impressive. It is no exaggeration of the facts to say that never before, in any nation, has there been a Congress so carefully planned or so extensively arranged.

At Montreal fifteen years ago, there were upwards of 700,000 visitors in attendance. With these figures to guide them, the Chicago committees have set their own figures at 1,000,000. This means that in all the plans for the Congress next June the committees have gone forward upon the assumption that a million visitors will repair to Chicago. A million visitors will thus have to be provided for. These will have to be transported, not only from all parts of the nation but from the four corners of the earth as well. A million strangers to Chicago will have to be welcomed fittingly, properly guided and directed, fed, housed and entertained, their health and safety protected and their part in the demonstration assured and accounted for. The extensive program—it is no mere make-shift but a carefully worked-out schedule—calls for an immense amount of detailed preliminary planning, involving voluminous correspondence, in a dozen different languages, with princes, prelates and preachers, scholars, scribes and students, in all parts of the world. At this writing the general plans for the Congress appear to have been perfected—no mean or simple undertaking in itself—and the great, the pressing task is to see to their proper execution.

In doing this the fact is always emphasized that the purpose of the Congress, its sole aim and *motif*, so to speak, is purely a spiritual one. Because of this nothing that might detract, even remotely, from the chief end to be attained shall be permitted. All that has to do with the arrangements, preliminary or otherwise, must conform to the one ideal. In the same fashion nothing is to be tolerated that might even suggest a profane or unworthy purpose. There is to be no commercialism and no suggestion of money making, of barter and sale. The expenses necessary to the proper financing of the Congress are certain to be enormous but these are to be met by the Catholics of Chicago, out of a fund to be gathered among themselves by voluntary contributions and without any

aid from those on the outside. It is the Chicago way and they will have none other.

I have merely suggested here and now the coming of the Eucharistic Congress to Chicago next June. But there is much more to be told of the splendid activity in preparation, of the many committees busily working away, day in and day out; there are the details of the program and no little important data, all of which is certain to be of profound interest to Catholics everywhere. An effort will be made to deal with these in other papers, soon to follow.

The Catholic and the Newspapers

ANDRUE H. BERDING

WHY is it that Catholics receive so little attention in the daily press? Do Catholics feel the want of this attention? What are the effects of publicity Catholics might obtain? These are questions I shall try to answer in this paper.

First, it is a fact that the space given to Catholic news in a big city daily is proportionately unrepresentative. Take the columns of any paper, Eastern, Midwestern or Western, and you will find the percentage of Protestant church news space three times that given to Catholic affairs. This is particularly the case on the regular church page day, which with some papers is Friday and with others Saturday, when a complete page is devoted to religious news. In the Southern papers, as might be expected, Catholic news is treated so meagerly that it is scarcely worth the compiling.

Why is all this?

To begin with, Catholics seldom if ever make a concentrated attempt to force their religion into public print. The average priest considers it beneath his dignity to seek position in the daily columns, and the Catholic layman is influenced directly or indirectly by this attitude.

Another thing is that newspapers usually find it difficult to obtain news of Catholic matters quickly. The average city editor will confess that he goes through a story of the death of a bishop, the coronation of an archbishop, the appointment of a coadjutor, with fear and trembling. Almost invariably he meets with hesitation on the part of the ecclesiastical authorities in getting the complete facts in time for his editions. The consequence of this is that the editor looks upon all Catholic news with hesitation, whether he is obliged to send for it or it is brought in and offered to him.

Many newspapers have adopted the following expedient to counteract this condition. They have designated one member of their staff who is a Catholic and who they think is fairly well acquainted with the executives of his Faith, to "cover" all Catholic events and be responsible for all Catholic news in the diocese. This is usually satisfactory, but the editor, and most frequently the copy-readers under him, have still the final say—shall this go in the paper or—the waste basket?

Take for granted, then, this condition—a hesitation to receive Catholic news and print it—what of it? Do Catholics actually want publicity?

To answer this question adequately, one must divide the term Catholic news into two parts. There is first the Catholic Church, in all that the word "Church," in its strict application, means, that is, services proper, whether they be the ordinary celebration of the Mass, extraordinary services, anniversary observances, or so on. And then there are the extraneous Catholic affairs—the Catholic clubs, events, meetings, visitors, benefits, performances, and so on through the gamut.

For the first division the average Catholic feels no especial necessity for publicity. He believes that crowded churches can be made but little more crowded by a broadcasting in print. And he believes, and rightly so, that the flamboyant publicity methods sought by most Protestant congregations, their glaring advertisements, their billboards and sensational press-agent promotions, detract from the dignity of their religion. He would not wish them applied to his own Faith, feeling that an artificial means of inducing attendance at church services would convey the impression that the services had little attraction in themselves.

In advertisements he would permit Catholic churches to announce only special services; for instance, "Forty Hours' Devotion," and extra Masses on a Holyday.

Now for the second division. It is upon this that most bones are picked, most heads grow bald and many gentle words become strained. There is without doubt a desire by Catholics to see their activities in print. They behold Protestant affairs boosted into social prominence by money-making publicity. And there is no reason on earth why Catholic activities should not meet the same reception, if the proper methods are followed.

Catholic clubs. . . . The Knights of Columbus beyond question of doubt, form the largest Catholic organization in America. It is estimated that for every Knight there are from two to three Masons. But do the Knights obtain from one-third to one-half the space given to the Masons? Not at all. Look, for instance, at the initiations of the respective organizations. Are the names of the candidates to the K. of C. printed? No. Are the names of candidates to the Masons? Invariably, with all the hackneyed rigamarole of "crossing the burning sands," and so on. There is many a Knights of Columbus initiation that never finds its way into print, but scarcely do the Masons take others into their order without reading about it in the papers.

After the Knights there are few Catholic lay societies that have any influence in newspaper circles. Run over the list. Are there any you ever see given such prominence as the Knights of Pythias, the Odd Fellows, and like ilk?

When we come to the Catholic women's clubs there is at once a difference—a difference that is the key to this whole discussion. In almost every city the Catholic Women's club, whatever be its name, is given more space in the aggregate than the leading Catholic men's organization. In proportion to its membership, its influence, it is fairly dealt with by the newspapers, in comparison with the corresponding Protestant or non-sectarian women's

organizations. Its name, its members, are frequently on the woman's page, in the society column, or "run wild," that is, in the main body of the paper. Now why?

In the first place the average woman is vastly different from the average man when it comes to seeking publicity. The man detests to go to the editorial rooms and present his facts. The woman steps right in and rather relishes it. And—she customarily gets what she wants, or something approximating it.

Well, that is the secret.

The newspaper is too busy, far too busy, to go out and find out what the Catholic organization is doing. The matter must be brought in. And brought in a way that does not make the editor swear as he reads it. The Masonic organization will take a trained newspaper man, a Mason, to handle their publicity. They give him some inducement in the way of payment, remittance of dues, awarding of credentials, and so on. But the Catholic organization will pick on a hardware man, and tell him to "go to it."

His idea of writing a newspaper account covering the affairs of his club is to put it into verse or in flowing periods. Seldom, if ever, will he have a name to hinge it on; the who, when and where will probably be in the last sentence. No wonder the item is given to a jaded reporter to slap into four or five lines. If you want favors from a newspaper meet the paper half way. The newspaper is too busy taking seven league jumps here and there to saunter over in your direction and inquire what it's all about.

Campaigns for the raising of money have been extraordinarily frequent in the last several years. Catholics, too, have had their "drives." If ever the value of publicity has been felt so keenly it is in these campaigns. But no newspaper is going to run an institution's campaign. There is only one thing to do—hire a trained press agent and pay him.

Now what are the effects of Catholic publicity? That any publicity, in no matter what channels, has the effect of stirring up interest, is not to be doubted.

There is first the effect on Catholics, then on Protestants. To the Catholic publicity of the activities of his fellow-religionists conveys the impression that his Church is alive, awake, stepping along with the march of things. The Catholic is encouraged to contribute his own efforts to this work of accomplishment. By taking a part he solidifies his faith.

To the Protestant this publicity gives a similar impression. He looks from the outside through the window. He sees bustle and vigorous work going on within. Why should he not be in the swim? At any rate he will better respect the swimmers.

To conclude, publicity is an asset, just as so many dollars and cents. Use it judiciously, gather its harvest. Remember always there is a reaction to a slopping over or tainting of publicity. But don't, Mr. Average Catholic, be afraid of the ogres of that bedlam commonly known as the editorial and news rooms. Knock on the elevator door, and at least the man will open it for you.

Catholic Foundations and Canon Law

CLAUDE H. HEITHAUS, S.J.

TO be concerned for the spiritual welfare of the Catholics who are attending non-Catholic universities is not only licit, but highly praiseworthy and in accordance with the Encyclical of Pius X on the Teaching of Christian Doctrine. No one, least of all the present writer, objects to the ministrations of a zealous priest, administering the Sacraments, giving sermons, teaching converts, conducting religion classes for the students, encouraging them in personal interviews and laboring zealously from morning to night to counteract the baneful influence of the non-Catholic and sometimes anti-Catholic instruction and social atmosphere. By all means let us do what we can and may to save some planks from the wreckage.

But when a chaplaincy is used as propaganda for the State university, when Catholics are lured to the "Great State university," the "great pivotal, crucial, strategic center of the educational life of the State" by a chaplain's sermons and pamphlets, when the State university plus a Catholic Foundation is held up as the "ideal solution" of our higher educational problem, when the chaplain repeats with ever-increasing clearness and emphasis that if the Church in America could get rid of her universities and educate her children at State universities with a few hours of religious instruction thrown in on the side—when that happens, it becomes a duty "to speak sound doctrine on this subject, precisely as the Holy See announces it. It is a betrayal of God's sacred cause to neglect this duty."

Catholics who see in the Illinois Foundation plan nothing more than a zealous effort to make the best of a bad situation, an effort similar to the work of the Catholic Instruction League for the unfortunate children of the public schools—are doomed to a painful disillusionment. The Catholic Foundation, as understood by Doctor O'Brien, is not merely a remedial measure, an attempt to save the souls of the Catholic students while discouraging their attendance at non-Catholic colleges. Doctor O'Brien does not look upon the attendance of Catholics at non-Catholic colleges as having a bare *tolerari potest*, a concession on the part of the Holy See to the fact that there are still some courses not offered by Catholic colleges (though I have shown that most of the Catholics are without this justifying fact in their favor). It is no part of his plan to make merely temporary provision for the Catholics at State universities while devoting the major part of our energy to the perfecting of Catholic colleges and universities. No, in spite of his repeated protestations of affection for the Catholic College, he is in principle and in act opposed to Catholic universities as we now have them and frankly affirms that the Church would be the gainer if she could replace them with Catholic Foundations at State universities.

Standing before the State convention of the Knights of Columbus at Springfield, Illinois, on May 12, 1925, Doctor O'Brien enunciated his philosophy of education in no obscure or ambiguous terms. He said:

If another agency (the State) will relieve her (the Church) of the heavy burden of teaching these technical, industrial subjects, and an arrangement can be made at the same time whereby the Church can impart thorough systematic courses in religion to these students, the Church has gained, not lost (pp. 6 and 7 of the printed address).

Among the subjects which the Church had better get rid of are mentioned specifically physics, chemistry, mathematics, engineering and agriculture, but all the collegiate and professional branches are meant, as will appear from the following facts: (1) Doctor O'Brien gives as his reason for his stand the argument that the formal teaching of religion is the sole business of the Church. Hence it follows that biology, the languages, sociology, history and all other branches are ruled out for the same reason as mathematics and physics, viz., they are not formal religion courses; (2) Doctor O'Brien offers his plan as the solution of the problem of training lay apostles. He holds up the Catholics at Illinois as representing "the potential leadership of the Church in this commonwealth" and after stating that "thoroughly trained in literature and the arts, disciplined in the sciences, these young men will be our lawyers, our doctors, our legislators, our teachers, our editors, and our industrial experts," he says; "Where, I ask, is that scholarly leadership which will champion the cause of the Church and defend her in every crisis . . . to be found, if not among her (Illinois University's) students, trained at the outstanding educational center of the State? Yes, trained leadership for the Church is to be obtained here in rich abundance—provided we do our part" i.e., erect a Foundation; (3) Doctor O'Brien's literature and Foundation appeal to students of all branches without exception and no provision is made in his plan for eliminating those who have no adequate reason for being at the State university. Rather, the contrary is true.

Thus we see that, according to Doctor O'Brien, the ideal place for a Catholic student to be in is a State university with a Foundation attached. Let us now dig a little deeper.

Catholic education does not mean the teaching of physics or chemistry or mathematics by the Church. Catholic education consists essentially in the teaching of Catholic religion. Remove this from the curriculum of the Catholic college and you would have but secular education. Instill that into the secular curriculum and you preserve the essential feature of Catholic education. That is why the *Catholic Foundation constitutes the heart of Catholic education* (page 6, printed address. Author's italics).

Do we realize what that means? Let us ponder it well for it is the principal argument by which the Illinois Foundation has been promoted. If it is sound, then we must logically abandon our schools of medicine, dentistry, law, commerce, engineering, journalism, music, nursing, sociology and even our colleges of arts and science. We are wasting our money and the Religious Orders are all spending themselves on a foolish cause, for Wisconsin, Chicago, Columbia, California, Texas, and all the other non-Catholic universities could be converted into Catholic colleges by the simple process of attaching a chaplain and offering classes in catechism. Am I exaggerating? Listen to Doctor O'Brien:

The Catholic Foundation means the establishment of a Catholic College at the very door of the State university. Let there be no misunderstanding. The establishment of the Foundation indicates no break in the age-old traditions of Catholic education. On the contrary, it means the continuance and the fulfillment of these traditions and their intelligent application to the changed conditions of modern life (p. 5).

Note this well; by the mere addition of a three-semester course in religion, Illinois University becomes for the Catholic students a fully constituted Catholic college—an institution just as Catholic in every essential point as St. Viator's or St. Norbert's or St. Mary's or Holy Cross. On the other hand, subtract the religion courses from Notre Dame and it thereby becomes a secular, non-Catholic university, the same as the University of Indiana.

And what of the professional schools in Catholic universities? Why, since no formal religion classes are taught in them, it follows that they are non-Catholic colleges. Our schools of medicine, law, education, sociology, and nursing, if only we had known it, are not Catholic schools at all. They are essentially the same as the non-Catholic schools. Furthermore, we have no business maintaining them any longer. Close up the Catholic University of America, close up Notre Dame and Villanova and Dayton and DePaul and Marquette and St. Louis and Creighton. The Church would "gain and not lose" if we could get rid of them. Let us have Catholic Foundations instead.

But why stop there? Are they not teaching mathematics and physics and chemistry and geography and civics in our Catholic high schools and parish schools? The Church has no business teaching these things. Her sole and essential *raison d'être* is to teach religion (see page 7, printed address). You see we are wasting our money here, too. Send the children to the public schools and join in with the Methodists and Baptists in their plan to get religion classes added to the public school curriculum. Let the Catholic Instruction League do the work; pack the Religious Orders off to Africa to convert the heathen!

So the addition of religion classes will convert a non-Catholic university into a Catholic college! Do we all realize what a non-Catholic university may be and often is? Let us pay a visit to a certain State university in the Middle West that I am familiar with. The proudest boast of this university is its brand of academic freedom (some people call it license). Let us see what this freedom leads to in practice. Here is a biology professor proving beyond all cavil that man is nothing more than a hairless mammal in a collar and tie. Here is a sociology professor who throws his class into convulsions by his clever flings at the Ten Commandments and revealed religion. Here is a professor of philosophy who begins the year's work by remarking: "If there are any men or women in this class who still entertain primitive notions about God and hell and similar remnants of ancient superstition, I would ask them to leave them at the door as they enter my classroom." Over in that building across the green is a psychology professor who requires his pupils to repeat his exact teaching in their examinations and that teaching is that there is no such thing as a spiritual, personal, immortal soul. Soul? The professor of anatomy has some-

thing to say about that. "Boys," says he, as he spits a streak of tobacco juice athwart the sunken chest of a cadaver in the "stiff room," "boys, I want you to skin this stiff, dissect his muscles, trace every nerve, remove and examine the brain, and when you have taken him completely apart, I want you to keep an eye open for the soul. I want the first man who finds the *soul* to report the discovery to me. It will be a remarkable find!"

Across the hall the professor of obstetrics and gynecology is lecturing. There are, as is known, four degrees of abortion allowed by the State law. Is that all that the professor is teaching? Would to God it were, but it is enough, for each of those four degrees is murder. In another building we find the professor of history. "Christianity," says he, "borrowed many practices and beliefs from the pagan religions round about it. Take holy water, for instance. They got that from the Roman lustral water. And there is the idea of a virgin mother of God. That idea was as old as the hills. Most pagan religions have a similar deity. The Christians took over the notion from the Egyptians." And now we come to the "Lit" building. The class in the Italian of the Renaissance is now in session. What is the text? God help us! I cannot mention it. And over here is a class in Latin. What are these boys and girls poring over with flushed faces? A rotten play, unexpurgated. The jokes are the best part of it! Leave them out, the jokes? Nonsense. Why butcher a masterpiece? And then what would happen to the teacher's sly remarks? He is an awfully clever fellow. The class "gets a big kick out of his stuff."

Such is the State university as I know it. Is that what Doctor O'Brien will convert into a Catholic college by adding a professor of religion to its staff of one thousand instructors and one subject, religion, to its two hundred or more courses? Do this, and presto, we have a Catholic college. Does Doctor O'Brien know what a Catholic school is? Let him read canon law. Here is what the Holy See has to say on the subject: "From childhood all the Faithful must be so educated that . . . they [are] *taught nothing contrary to faith or morals*"; "Catholic children must not attend non-Catholic, neutral or mixed schools; that is, such as are also open to non-Catholics"; "It is desirable that a Catholic university be founded wherever the public universities are not *imbued with Catholic teaching and feeling*"; "It is the right and duty of the Bishops to take care that *nothing is taught or done against the Faith or sound morals in any of the schools in their territory*"; "The Bishops also have the right to approve the teachers of religion and the *textbooks*, and further to require that *texts be dropped and teachers removed when religion or morality demands it*."

Such are the requirements, such the qualifications which the Church lays down for a Catholic school. I invite Doctor O'Brien to show us in what manner a State university, plus an optional course in religion, which as a matter of fact, was taken by only 40 out of 888 students during the first semester of last year, conforms to these requirements. How will one solitary chaplain dominate the president and his staff of one thousand teachers?

O'Reilly, Bolshevik

HANORA MARY DENNY

HE was a quiet, suave, conservative young man, with whom I was associated in a business way; so pathetically willing to conform his philosophy of life to yours as to make him not colorless but chameleonesque.

He did not mind telling me as one Catholic to another that things looked dubious for the Church in the light of modern science. Neither did he see how the Church could adjust herself to the "Spirit of the New Democracy."

It was from him that I first heard of O'Reilly. "A good enough fellow, O'Reilly, but so blatant, a regular radical—a Bolshevik."

You may imagine, therefore, my amazement when I beheld this identical O'Reilly at the opening of a new Catholic school, beaming benevolently through tortoiseshell-rimmed glasses; on excellent terms with his Reverence and opening the door with joyful respect for the good Sisters.

Presently, when he saw me, he hailed me heartily and with a friendly warmth. When I informed him, rather dazedly, that I had not known he was a Catholic he took my unfortunate remark extremely ill.

"Good Heavens," he exclaimed, "I'd like to know why not? If I have actually concealed my spiritual identity under a vacuous exterior, a really bright person could have deduced from my last name in conjunction with my first initials of F. X., together with my K. of C. pin openly displayed on my lapel, that I am at least making a hollow pretense of being a Catholic."

Reduced by this discourse to complete imbecility, I feebly informed him that "I had thought him a radical—a Bolshevik; I had—er—formed that opinion from chance remarks; and had not the immortal Shakespeare himself been in difficulties as to the significance of a name?"

Strange to say these meanderings put him in a good humor again. "Bolshevik!" he exclaimed, "that would be J. P. I recognize 'his fine Italian hand' in that. He has always called me that ever since he heard me quoting some really radical stuff in an argument on economics once." O'Reilly chuckled. "Leo XIII's Encyclical on Labor it was."

"Has he ever told you (after you had forced the admission from him) that he was not ashamed of being a Catholic? He was not ashamed, mind you, of belonging to that great Church, founded by Christ, Himself, that illustrious Church, Mother of Truth, Protectress of the Arts, Science"—O'Reilly grew so eloquent that several who had stopped to listen cried out: "Hear! Hear!"

He led me firmly aside a few paces and continued: "He has made himself acquainted with every new and false doctrine, while remaining culpably ignorant of his own Faith until he has lost his spiritual viewpoint."

Charity seemed to compel me to lay the blame on his university training. O'Reilly sighed. "Yes, yes, I know. I went to it myself. He and I graduated together from it. Of course it is hardly the school calculated to nurture

future vocations, but it goes further back than that. It goes back to the Catholic parents who still hope to reconcile material prosperity, which they seek first, with eternal verities; to bring about peace with the world, the flesh and the devil and still keep the Faith.

"As you know, in my time there was no Catholic institution of university rank in this part of the country. Even today there is none that gives technical training of any sort. I had no choice but to attend, but J. P.'s father could have sent him half way around the world to attend school if he had wished.

"I made up my mind when I entered the U. that I would put up a stiff fight for my principles. Do not misunderstand me. I was courteous and respectful to the professors, but I challenged every false statement made in my classes. Most of the professors were glad to get the other point of view, or said they were. Only a few were hardened bigots.

"How hard it is to take the attitude I assumed in the secular university, with public opinion dead against you, will never be known to those who are ignorant of the real situation. Even the majority of the Catholic pupils are timid, fearful for their standing, unwilling to commit themselves, indignant with the militant one, and often grossly ignorant of the Catholic position and doctrine.

"I had the worst time of all in philosophy. Just think of a Catholic boy, without any philosophical foundation, taking a hodge-podge of pagan philosophy: Kant, Hume, Rousseau, Comte, Nietzsche, Descartes and Spinoza. Scholastic philosophy was given only a brief and contemptuous treatment which made it seem childish and ridiculous. It turns me cold to think of it even now. I have sat up half the night to clear up one false statement, only to have a dozen others come up in the next day's lecture.

"Professor Osgood was a rank materialist and he and I were hot and heavy at it all the time, with poor old J. P. shunning me as though I had the plague for fear I might implicate him in my folly. Of course I didn't know so much but I tried hard to prevent the Doctor from 'putting anything over on me.' Oh, of course, I have no doubt that he slipped a-plenty by without my perceiving it, but not while little Francis X. was 'on the job.'

"Well when it came time for my thesis I put up as good a Catholic paper as I could. I obtained all the Catholic references that I could lay hands on and if you think it is easy to get such references just try it yourself. There are none at the university and very few at the Public Library. The people who have such references or could have helped were very cool and indifferent about the matter.

"Osgood flunked me. Think of it,—a Senior and an 'A' student,—my first and only flunk. I was sore. After a bit I pulled myself together and said: 'Come, Francis X., you'll carry this matter to his chiefs. You shall take them in order and appeal if necessary to the President and the Regents, seeking after justice. Dean X. shall be the first Court of Appeal.'

"Dean X. was the Dean of my college, a nice old

infidel; one of those calm kindly impartial ones. He was the most dangerous man on the campus because he was so fine and broad and sincere. All the boys copied him, his dress, his mannerisms and his philosophy.

"So I tucked my poor thesis into my pocket and went over to interview him. When he saw me he said, 'Well, well, O'Reilly, what good wind blows you over to see your old Dean?' 'Dean,' I answered, 'I'm acquiring wisdom at such a rate of speed that I feel I'll have to relieve myself of some of it.'

"The Dean laughed. 'What particular tiny fragment have you attempted to assimilate that has disagreed with you?'

"So I made answer: 'I've just discovered what academic freedom, as enunciated by a college professor, may really mean.' With that I gave him my thesis and asked him to look it over.

"When he had read it over, he said: 'Why, O'Reilly, this is good stuff, well and thoughtfully written; above the average. Why he can't flunk you for this; this is good stuff.'

"Well, Dean,' I replied, 'I had a similar kind of sneaking suspicion that he couldn't, but it seems to be demonstrated that he thinks he can; anyhow he has.' But the Dean only kept repeating over in a pained kind of way; 'No, no. He can't do that. He positively cannot do that.'

"Finally he gave me a gentle smile and said: 'I'm afraid, O'Reilly, that you have been making yourself obnoxious about something or other. It may be, now, that in the realm of the philosophy of biological science you have proved narrow—origins or something of that sort, eh?' (The Dean was strong on evolution.) 'Is that, perhaps, the rock on which you split?'

"Rock on which we split!' cried I. 'Why, Dean, the whole course has been a rapids full of rocks and we've split on every one; didn't miss one rock that I am aware of. Dr. Osgood is a rank materialist and simply cannot tolerate anyone in his classes who believes in a Personal God . . .'

"The Dean interrupted me quickly with a 'But, dear boy, it would be too—well, naive and medieval—for a university graduate to believe in an anthropomorphic God; white beard, gold throne, gold foot-stool and all.'

"See, here, Dean,' I blazed out, 'I'm rather tired of hearing that old fairy tale of Herbert Spencer's repeated so often. Such a description of God is an insult to the intelligence of any seven-year-old Catholic child. In their naive, medieval catechism they learn that God is a pure bodiless Spirit, omnipotent and omnipresent. And as for origins—I cast caution to the winds—I don't mind telling you that a fellow cannot help wavering upon the subject in the face of some of the specimens of humanity he meets.'

"The Dean laughed and said, dryly: 'But not you Catholics? Surely your family tree is safe?'

"We Catholics, sir,' I spoke stiffly, 'do not believe in the evolution of the soul. We are from Adam who was from God, but we do not object to others acknowledging

their ancestry if they wish. It's a wise child who knows his own parents.'

"But the poor old Dean was not listening. He was pale with emotion. In a shocked tone he cried: 'Is it possible, my poor, poor boy, that you do not know that Higher Criticism has destroyed the Adam mythus?'

"Dean,' I retorted, 'I'm most dreadfully sorry to pain and disappoint you, but Higher Criticism doesn't mean a single thing in my young life. I'm like the devil mentioned in the Acts. You remember that some faker was trying to cast him out in the name of Paul. That old demon cried out 'Jesus I know and Paul, but who art thou?' The authority of the Catholic Church I know and respect, but the authority of that bunch of German infidels known as the School of Higher Criticism I don't know or care a hang for.'

"Poor Dean X. just sat and shook his head and murmured something about 'the tyranny of a fixed idea, and in one so young and promising.' For once in my misguided life I failed to rise to the controversial bait. After a pause he said 'Well, well, O'Reilly, I can see how your adamant attitude of mind has proved slightly irritating to the good Doctor. For the sake of all concerned it is best you two be separated.' Then he took his blue pencil and wrote across my thesis: 'Grade O'Reilly "A"' and signed his name to it.

"You can see from my little tale," said O'Reilly, "that I was a thick-skinned youngster. I didn't mind when they poked fun at me and I did not care when they tried to 'put it over me' with their superior airs and scientific authority. But most young students are sensitive and would suffer torments of humiliation over it. You can see how poor J. P. has reacted to it and there are only too many of this type."

"Still," I remarked, "one might conclude from your story that a Catholic properly equipped would be comparatively safe in a secular university."

"Sure," answered O'Reilly. "I also think that a man properly equipped is comparatively safe in a den of lions; and that a soldier properly equipped, gas-mask and all, is comparatively safe in the first-line trenches; but I, myself, for my boy Francis X. Junior, shall select a safer and less exposed site."

I SHALL GO SOFTLY

I shall go softly, now, throughout my days—
Remembering fall of April rain, and June,
With scented lanes, beneath a crescent moon—
Emblems of youth in all its mystic ways.
I shall recall the tender wind that sways
Grey mosses o'er a jasmine-sweet lagoon,
Where joyous morning climbs to golden noon
Filled with the birds' ecstatic roundelays.

Though softly through my days henceforth I go
Life's beauty still shall lasting solace be;
Each gleam of sunset gilding ancient hills
Shall leave within my heart a warming glow;
Each autumn-painted leaf shall gladden me,
And I shall joy at Springtime daffodils.

LOUISE CRENSHAW RAY.

Education

The School Fight in Washington

LOUIS GERSON

THREE new measures to extend State control of all schools have been introduced by Representative Egbert in the legislature of the State of Washington. House bill No. 70 requires State certification of all private and parish school teachers. As the parish schools of Washington already comply with this condition, the significance of the bill lies in its grouping with the two other measures.

House No. 71 proposes to tax private schools, hospitals and other institutions, by omitting the exemptions provided under the existing legislation. The third measure reads as follows:

From and after the third day of September, 1926, all private and parochial schools in the State of Washington wherein children between the ages of 7 and 16 years are taught, i.e., the eight grammar grades, shall use for purposes of instruction only the text books and follow only the courses of instruction used, authorized, and required according to law for the same or similar grades in the public schools of the district in which such private or parochial schools are located: *Provided* nothing in this act shall be construed so as to prevent any parochial or other religious school within the State from the teaching of religious beliefs and doctrines in addition to the courses of instruction, and text books prescribed and required under the authority of the State.

Here, obviously, we have under the guise of fair language and honorable intent a very easy method of de-Catholicizing the Catholic school. To begin with, one of the most delicate and difficult of all tasks, as every school administrator knows, is to select textbooks. Many "standard" texts in the market today are utterly unfit for use in Catholic schools, since they either ignore religion entirely or attack it. Not a few of these books are widely used in the public schools. Should they be prescribed by Washington boards, the position of the Catholic school would be very critical. Next, when courses of instruction are absolutely in the hands of State or county officials, so much of the day could be set aside for required subjects that the teaching of religion could find place only after class hours or on Saturday or Sunday. And, finally, as has happened in other States, the local authorities might prescribe the teaching of subjects which, from the point of view of the private school, were quite unfit for the class room.

The bills reflect very clearly the modern un-American craze for compulsory uniformity by State decree. There are two classes of individuals who today advocate State monopoly in education. To the first class belong all who believe that what is called "business efficiency" is superior to anything that can be done by individual effort or by private enterprise. Apply modern efficiency methods, which have already proved their worth in other fields, to education, and the results must necessarily be better. To this it may be answered that the man who thinks that the principles and ideals of a business house or railroad or bank can be applied to an institution not founded to make money but to train minds and hearts, knows nothing of the purposes of education. If we have one thing to be

proud of in American progress, it is the power and dignity which result from private enterprise founded on the theory that men should be ashamed to ask others to do for them what they can do for themselves. A certain degree of State supervision in education is inevitable and necessary, but the less we have of it, the better both for the schools and for the States.

Others who promote the ideal of complete State control of education are, unfortunately, moved by a desire to divorce the school from all religious influence of whatever kind. Their purpose is the establishment of the de-Christianized school. Their language is veiled, but in their hearts they are with Viviani who a few years ago boasted that a godless Government had accomplished the magnificent work of expelling Almighty God from the schools as He had already been expelled from the State. Wisely does the Federal Constitution forbid Congress to meddle with religious affairs, and a similar prohibition is found in practically every State Constitution. But this does not mean, as Story pointed out years ago, that the State is indifferent to religion. It merely means what it says; that while every man may worship Almighty God according to the dictates of conscience without let or hindrance, the civil power will neither reward nor disqualify him because of his religious belief and practice. In the American ideal, God and His eternal laws of justice and righteousness are supreme. Any statute which disregards their claims is without authority. Under the pagan concept of the State, freedom and human rights have no real existence. Man is made for the State, not the State for man. Under the Christian concept, there can exist no rightful authority on part of the State to destroy rights which belong to man by reason of his very nature. Happily, the Supreme Court, following the Declaration of Independence, has again and again affirmed the existence of these rights, and in the Nebraska language law and the Oregon school law cases ranked among them the right of the parent to control the education of his child.

The right to teach, as Cardinal Mercier says, "is only another form of the right to express one's ideas. The State, therefore, cannot claim a monopoly of teaching. Private enterprise is a great factor in progress alike in the intellectual and the economic sphere." And he continues:

The action of the State must be limited to protecting, encouraging and, when necessary, seconding the initiative of others. Never must it supplant it. The State has no right to mold all its citizens in one type, or to oblige all to think alike, under the pretext of bringing about a perfect unity in the body politic. The right to teach, as to think, is derived from human personality and has no direct connection with the mission of the State.

Education is primarily a matter for action by the parents of the child to be educated, and not, primarily, a duty which devolves upon the State. This is the doctrine which, until the recent attacks by worshippers of the State, was dominant in this country. It is admitted that the State, because of its obligation to provide for the common welfare, may require certain conditions to be met by all schools, public or private; but it has no right to impose conditions which, practically, destroy the higher

right of parents to control the education of their children.

Finally, why tax the private school? Is the burden of maintaining the public schools so light in any State that its citizens can safely close the private schools without increasing the taxes which must be laid to pay the educational bill? If this fact be duly weighed, it is not probable that the plan will be welcomed in any State. Not only do the private schools contribute to the general progress of public education, but they lift a great burden from every community in which they exist. In this fact is found the real reason for exempting them from taxation. If the private schools in our large cities were to be closed, years would elapse before the school authorities would be able to provide for the children.

That these Washington bills are directed primarily against the Catholic schools of the State is plain. It is also plain that if enacted into law, the authorities would be vested with power to devise rules and regulations to close the Catholic schools. The Oregon law as been declared unconstitutional. The laws proposed in Washington aim to effect in another manner the ultimate purpose of the Oregon law—the destruction of freedom in education.

Sociology

"Send Me to Sing Sing"

PAUL L. BLAKELY, S.J.

AN old master of rhetoric once remarked in my hearing that for most public speakers the rule is this: the weaker the argument the louder the yell. From that day I have regarded loud speakers, particularly such as help out their vocal chords by banging on the table, with a degree of suspicion. Examples? *De mortuis nil nisi bonum*, but there is that honest brigadier of marines whose silence as he leaves the city which Lincoln Steffens judged corrupt but contented, is far more eloquent than his proclamations as he entered it. Also—but let us take the exceptions; Judge Lewis of Brooklyn, for instance, who in the old days did good service as district attorney. A law-enforcement league gave a dinner some weeks ago at which he was asked to relate his views. "Make the punishment fit the crime, he shouted"—I quote from the esteemed *World*, "as he slammed the table with both fists. There was a roar of applause."

Even for Manhattan it must have been a noisy occasion, and I trust that the truth of the remarks which followed was not obscured by the din which accompanied their utterance. "Today, who ever hears of a real sentence? Either the parole board intervenes or a governor pardons. The fear of jail is not a deterrent, for the discount on sentences is such that a prisoner may be out before he is in. Criminals select and dicker for the institution in which they will be incarcerated. They say 'Send me to Sing Sing. Moving pictures, vaudeville shows and what not of entertainment.'"

Let us pause for a word of comment. Two weeks ago Mayor Dever of Chicago wrote that while the courts of that city had sent about 1,100 criminals to the peniten-

tiary in two years, the parole board during that time had returned 950. One murderer, however, had not been sent back to Chicago, and at the very time the Mayor was complaining that the parole board freed prisoners almost as fast as the courts jailed them, this homicide could not be found. Then a startling story, which explains fairly well why parole boards are falling into disrepute, was disclosed. In 1922 the prisoner had received a life sentence. Last Summer, acting, it would appear, under the authority of an old and forgotten statute, the Governor changed the charge from murder to manslaughter. Thereupon the case passed to the parole board, and the board promptly released the prisoner, who in addition to the crime for which he had been sentenced had probably been implicated in another murder, and certainly had been connected with about sixty robberies and other crimes of violence. What moved the Governor and the board to conclude that this confirmed criminal was fit to be loosed upon the public, does not appear in the record. It is even said that no record exists. But the Bar Association of the City of Chicago protested, the newspapers protested, and even the public protested—feebly—and the result is that the prisoner has been apprehended and returned to jail. How long he will remain there is another question.

Surely, no one need seek far for proof of Judge Lewis' table-banged words. "Sentimentality breaks down the administration of justice, and weakens respect for all authority. The right of pardon is exercised too frequently and loosely today."

Too much sympathy is wasted on the so-called "first offender." In many instances the first offender is an old offender, now caught for the first time. Punishment is not what it was twenty-five years ago. Whenever detection is slow, prosecution slow, and the punishment not commensurate, the underworld finds its chance.

Let us now listen to Judge John Barton Payne, formerly judge in a Chicago criminal court, Secretary of the Interior under President Wilson, and at present executive head of the Red Cross. In an interview published in the *New York World* for December 20, 1925, Judge Payne appears to single out as the most serious weakness in the administration of justice "weak, sympathetic and incompetent judges," thereby shifting an emphasis usually laid upon perjured juries and unscrupulous lawyers. He agrees with Judge Lewis, however, that "sentimentality is not only defeating justice, but is definitely encouraging the criminal." We shall not greatly reduce the amount of crime in this country, he thinks, until we nerve ourselves to punish the criminal surely, speedily and adequately. Sentimentality not only surrounds and protects him in the court room, but often prevents him from ever reaching the bar of justice, and follows him, when convicted, into the penitentiary. When asked why it is that the United States has more crime than any nation in the civilized world, Judge Payne answered:

If this is true, it is because the laws are not enforced. Our theory that all men are innocent until clearly proven guilty is worked to such an extreme by weak, sympathetic or incompetent judges that the chances of conviction have grown relatively small. The criminal feels that his chances of getting off are so great that he is willing to take a risk.

That puts the case excellently. The criminal is not deterred by fear of punishment because he knows that the probability of detection is slight and of conviction slighter, while release by pardon or by a parole, in the mischance of conviction, is almost certain. In other words, punishment never deters when it is not inflicted. It is not inflicted, even supposing the process to go so far as to include an indictment, because too many jurors violate their oath to brush aside private opinion and to be guided solely by the law and the facts; because too many judges are weak and sympathetic, because parole boards exceed their powers; and for a variety of reasons, all of which sift down ultimately into a "sentimentality" which in reality is disregard for the principle of authority.

When did this contempt of justice begin with us? Judge Lewis sets the time as approximately 1900. Perhaps it would be more accurate to say that it merely began to manifest itself more openly in the first years of the present century. The cause was posited many years ago, and first, I think, in our colleges. This is a thesis which I may be permitted to develop at another time.

Note and Comment

One Result Of Christmas Giving

SO almost negligible is the item, in the average American's Christmas outlay, of the amount expended for the little Christmas Seals, now so popular in the season's correspondence, that the individual user scarcely reckons the expense. Yet it should be a source of gratification to the benevolent to know of the work that has thus been made possible, among the victims of tuberculosis. Referring to the campaign which has been carried on against the dread disease in New York State, U. S. Senator James W. Wadsworth, Jr., notes that the sale of Christmas Seals supports fifty-four county and city associations, whose efforts have helped to promote better health through educational methods and through the provision of nursing and clinic advantages, the results of which are significant.

Since 1907, when the tuberculosis work was first organized in New York State, the death rate from this plague has declined from 152.7 to 97.1 per 100,000 population; the number of public tuberculosis hospital beds . . . has increased in this period from 224 to 3,482; dispensaries from 2 to 45; public health nurses from 2 to 1,240; children's health camps from none to 26, and children's preventoria from none to 16.

Without adverting, perhaps, to the purpose which these health stamps were calculated to further, their purchasers have helped to spread happiness not only through the Christmas holidays, but, in many cases, through the entire lifetime of those ultimately benefited.

An Ounce Of Prevention

ALTOGETHER seasonable is the advice contained in a recent bulletin of the Prudential Service Bureau, issued at Newark, N. J., "Catching cold," it informs us, is not merely the result of a chance drenching to the

skin, nor just the aftermath of sitting in a draught. We may thus precipitate the development of a cold, but its origin must be traced to the result of an infection which a run-down body is not able to counteract. Wherefore, suggests Dr. J. Allen Patton, medical director of the Prudential Insurance Co., we should keep ourselves in the best physical condition through plenty of outdoor exercise, avoidance of over-fatigue, proper diet, and sane clothing suitable to the thermometer. In this way we lessen the danger of "taking cold," for we have a better chance of ridding ourselves promptly of the infection to which we are subject in crowded cars and trains, theaters or churches, because of exposure to storm or to an unexpected change of weather. The latter may cause a chill that results in congestion; this affects the blood-stream, throws more work upon the heart and renders the lungs incapable of getting their full supply of oxygen through the air. If the digestive system has been impaired through faulty eating the resistance of the body is in a still more feeble condition, and any germ that is inhaled finds a fertile spot for growth. Even the slightest cold, notes Dr. Patton, should receive prompt attention. If possible, one should stay in bed for a day, having the room well ventilated, and partaking of light, easily digestible food. But the proverbial ounce of prevention along the lines suggested will afford immunity to the rigors of winter that might otherwise lay one low.

In Which We Heartily Agree

PROBABLY there is no calling in the world in which a man receives so many titles as in the ministry, observes a writer in the *Living Church*. Mister, Father, Pastor, Rector, Doctor, Reverend are some of these enumerated by the Episcopalian writer which greet the cloth of other denominations. "Revenue" also enters the category, now and then, always of course in sheer guilelessness. As the article notes, "Reverend" can be used correctly only when followed by "Doctor," "Father" or the Christian name of the clergyman addressed, i.e., the Reverend John Jones, and its author asks his readers to cooperate in stopping a practice which is to say the least bad English. Seconding the motion, we would only suggest that the good work be not limited to those who read the *Living Church*. This very morning's mail reminds us again that the practice is so widespread as to respect neither sects nor dignitaries.

In the Field Of Scripture

DISTRIBUTION is being made, from the Capuchin College, Washington, D. C., of the Report of the Seventh Annual Meeting of the Franciscan Educational Conference, which was held in Cincinnati, last June. In the appended report of the Committee on Resolutions, record is made of the determination of the assembled Friars "to follow carefully the trail blazed for us by our illustrious predecessors in upholding immune the Bible from the insidious attacks of non-Catholic opponents, and

in promoting positive work along the lines laid down for us by Holy Mother Church." Telling impetus to this characteristic zeal of the sons of St. Francis must have been given by the scholarly addresses and discussions of which the Cincinnati gathering was witness. Such subjects were treated as: "Biblical Scholars in the Franciscan Order," "The Bible as the Inspiration of Priestly and Religious Living," "Present Status and Trend of Biblical Research," "Recent Regulations of the Holy See Pertaining to the Study of Sacred Scripture in the Theological Seminaries," and "Practical Use of the Bible in Ascetical Theology, in Catechetics, and especially in Homiletics." Abundant evidence is afforded in the near-300 page report, of the ideals of the Friars Minor, the Minor Capuchins and the Minor Conventuals, as represented by their scholars and educators whose papers are reprinted there. The work is an earnest of the refutation which the members of the Franciscan Order are bringing to bear on the hackneyed "Chained Bibles" charge, and the alleged neglect of Bible reading on the part of Catholics.

A Sign of
the Times?

SOME of the recorded writings of George Washington may be more familiar to his countrymen of the present generation than the one hundred and ten rules of good morals and gentle manners which he has handed down to us in his "Rules of Civility." We are told that, as a boy, the Father of his Country copied over and over those maxims, the teaching of which was combined with instruction in penmanship, according to the method of the copy-books which even in our own day were not altogether discarded. The constant rewriting of those good maxims, it is safe to say, contributed not a little to the formation of his great character. One of Washington's principal rules might very profitably be impressed on the copy-pages of certain modern Americans who write, not for the sake of orthography, but for publication. It is this rule: "When you speak of God or His attributes, let it be seriously in reverence." The suggestion is made in consequence of a growing disgust with the output of so many works of fiction in which the name of God is sounded from the mouths of incidental characters, without either rhyme, reason or reverence. It is, one likes to feel, only to a precious small proportion of readers that such a depraved taste can possibly appeal. Why publishers, whose reputation is involved in the volumes for which they are responsible, can countenance the tendency, is a source of wonder to many. There is a Divine Precept, sacred to Jew and Christian alike, which reads: "Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain." Where this sacred prohibition fails to appeal, and one does not "labor to keep alive in his breast that little spark of celestial fire called conscience," according to another maxim of the First President, it were perhaps useless to expect that regard for mere decency or civility can awaken much response.

THE FIRST CHRISTMAS HOLIDAYS

Thirty thousand angels came—
Says the ancient Polish lore—
To the cave of Bethlehem
The wee Christ Child to adore.

And they filled the place with light,
Light reflected from the Throne
On their great soft wings of white—
God's light carried to His own
Dear Son in the stable lone.

And the Polish peasant tells
How the little angels played
With the Christ Child when they came—
Quite at ease and unafraid.

Heaven's gates you see were closed
Had been closed since Adam's sin;
And there were no babies there
For God could not let them in.

How the angels loved this Babe
Wished to fondle and caress Him!
Even hoped His mother might
Let them wash Him and help dress Him.
Little angels wished to bless Him.

But the Blessed Mother knew
She could serve her Baby best
And she told the little angels
To be quiet; the Child must rest:
And she clasped Him to her breast.

Oh they hushed each other then
Made soft noises with their wings
While she crooned a lullaby
To the sound like muted strings—
Made by angels' quivering wings.

And they tried to be quite still
While the little Jesus slept
Almost made no noise at all.
Thirty thousand angels kept
Quiet while the Infant slept!

But oh, when the Baby woke,
Then the angels' fun began!
Never have been such good times
In the tale of God and man.

For the angels all took turns
Doing tricks: the little One
Gurgled, sometimes laughed aloud
With the angels. 'Twas such fun

To see them playing with their wings—
Angels playing peek-a-boo—
Flying backward, soaring up
With rhythmic grace, as angels do.

Maybe playing "falling leaves"
As a modern birdman plays—
Don't you wish you had been there
Those first Christmas holidays?

RUTH MARY FOX.

Dramatics

Unclean Plays

ELIZABETH JORDAN

LAST month we discussed in these columns, as is our edifying habit, a number of the clean plays at present holding our stage. This month we shall discuss a few plays of the other sort. As a rule we ignore these, having no wish to arouse curiosity about them. Today we will take that risk; and such curiosity as we may arouse we are prepared to satisfy here and now, with a thoroughness intended to discourage any further interest in the productions.

We will begin with "The Green Hat," that so called "Romance" by Michael Arlen, the Armenian author, which A. H. Woods presents at the Broadhurst Theater, with Katharine Cornell in the role of Iris Fenwick.

Let us understand what "The Green Hat" is about. We learn first of all that it follows rather closely the novel from which it is taken—a novel that "swept the country" last year and thus gave us an interesting revelation concerning the sort of thing Americans are reading. In novel and play we are shown Iris Fenwick, born March, one of the "mad Marches" whose decay as a family is arousing the interest of social England. Iris and her dipsomaniac brother Gerald are the last of the lot. Iris always wears a green hat and an emerald ring. She marries "Boy Fenwick," a pal of Gerald's, and Fenwick kills himself on their wedding night because he has discovered that he is unfit to live. His suicide, which occurs at the beginning of the first act, has nothing to do with Iris; but it appears that "Boy Fenwick" was the only person Gerald March loved and respected. Therefore, when Gerald and others rush to the hotel after the suicide, Iris preserves her brother's ideal of the dead man by tacitly stating that he killed himself because he discovered her to be impure. This is supposed to be an action of such nobility that spectators catch their breaths. Indeed, when it is confessed by Iris in the last act all the characters do catch their breaths, and stand dumb before it.

Having thus wrecked her own reputation, and incidentally added to the wreck of her brother's life by her supposed disgrace (what brother on earth would want to hold the ideal of a friendship at the price of his sister's honor?) Iris proceeds to make good—or, rather, to make worse—her new fame. The second act follows the first after a ten-year interval, and in that interval Iris has become one of the most notorious women in Europe. She has repudiated all decent standards; she has had dozens of lovers. But all the time—need we add?—her heart has been true to the one man she ever loved, Napier Harpenden, whose father had wisely refused to allow him to marry her because she came of such a degenerate tribe. After ten years of mourning for her, Napier meets a nice girl, Venice Pollen, and the two fall healthfully in love. A few nights before their marriage Iris, having returned to England, comes to Napier's rooms and makes him forget Venice. Nevertheless, Venice marries him.

Nearly a year later Iris's child is born dead, and Iris sends for Napier, its father. Venice comes to the hospital with him, standing by her husband in his trouble. Iris seems touched by this. However, four months later she decides that she cannot live without Napier, so the two plan to run away together. At the last moment Iris relents and kills herself instead—but before that has happened, though after she has gone, Venice puts the capstone to the incredible idiocy of the play by falling into her husband's arms and bleating, "O Napier, she went away because you were not worthy of the kind of love she could give you!"

After Iris had killed herself and the audience had filed out of the theater wiping away its tears, we said to one of the sanest women we know, who was wiping her eyes at the moment: "Now tell us, purely as a matter of intellectual curiosity, *why* were you moved?"

She reflected, with another dab at her eyes.

"Well, of course the play is weak in spots," she admitted. "I suppose it's principally Miss Cornell's acting."

"Did you admire the character of Iris?"

"Why, no—not exactly. But, somehow, one couldn't help feeling all the time that there was so much good underneath the surface wickedness of Iris March."

One *could* help feeling that. This writer could help feeling it. Personally, we did not believe for one moment that Iris March had a redeeming feature. Even the other characters in the play—the old friends she estranged—claimed only one good quality for her, and that was sportsmanship. "She plays the game," they reiterated; and because they kept reiterating it the audience accepted it as a fact. But Iris March never played the game. Her one feeble effort to play it—her lie about the cause of Fenwick's death—was mawkishly stupid. To save a degenerate boy's ideal of his friend, she destroyed that boy's ideal of the sister he also loved. She wrecked first her own reputation and then her life; she lived among the debris of moral standards; even the playwright makes no excuse for her innumerable affairs—she was not driven by love or by privation; she destroyed the happiness of the one man who really loved her and whom she loved; she took him from his fiancée before marriage; she did her best to take him from his wife after marriage; she gave him up because she was sane enough to realize that she would ruin his life by breaking up his home and his career, and that therefore neither he nor she could hope for happiness together. Last of all, she killed herself because she could not have what she wanted. If all this is "playing the game," then "playing the game" is a different proposition from what it used to be.

Can there be any question as to the morally subversive influence of such a play? No thoughtful person can deny that the influence of "The Green Hat" is almost the worst exercised by any play on our stage this season. The menace it holds is particularly serious because so many young persons are seeing the play and talking about it and being influenced by its meretricious philosophy. They see their elders accepting as a touching and admirable figure an unrepentant adulteress whose adulteries were a

scandal to her whole community. They leave the theater sympathetic and tearful, while deep in their young minds and hearts lurks the thought that chastity cannot be as important as they have been taught it was, since everybody so admires this notoriously unchaste theatrical heroine. Thus, none too subtly, "The Green Hat" tears at the very foundation of our civilization—which is the chastity of women. If that goes, we all go. It has taken the Catholic Church two thousand years to build and maintain the position of honor and responsibility women hold today, but not even the Church can uphold that structure unless the women uphold the Church. Yet thousands of women, nice women, weep weakly over the sad career of Iris March. How, then, can we blame producers for putting on such a play? Morally, we are in a bad way.

Being now well warmed to our subject, we are ready to take up the Theater Guild's production of "The Glass Slipper," by Ferenc Molnar, with June Walker in the leading role. At first glance the theme of this play would seem to be innocent enough. A little "slavey," the Cinderella who does all the drudgery in a Budapest boarding house, falls in love with one of the boarders. Another "Merely Mary Anne," we reflect, till we know better. On this simple situation the Hungarian author has poured the cesspools of his country. One of New York's leading critics, noted for his open-mindedness, confessed the morning after the play's opening performance that certain lines in it turned his stomach. They would turn any stomach, yet they are uttered night after night and at the usual matinees, with no interference from the law. In the past the Theater Guild directors have put on some of our worst plays, as well as some of our best. From the beginning they have been obsessed by sex problems, and the obsession is growing. There is now an ominous muttering among their great following, to which they would do well to listen.

There are two kinds of immoral plays. There is the kind that is frankly indecent and makes no bones about it, such as "The Green Hat," "The Glass Slipper," and "The Cradle Snatchers;" and there is the kind that goes the limit for three or four acts under the cloak of a moral climax. To this second class belongs "The Vortex," by Noel Coward, who also takes the leading role.

He is the son of a vain and foolish woman who has been a beauty and a belle in her day. Though she has this grown son, she cannot realize that her day is over. She still must have excitement, admiration, lovers—and she has them all. Her son overhears a scene with the latest lover and realizes at last the truth about his mother's life. Late that night he goes to her room and taxes her with it. She denies, then confesses; but he cannot make her see herself as she is. She will go on, nothing can save her. Or can it? He confesses himself a drug fiend and in desperate need of her help. The final curtain shows them in an embrace of reconciliation, each determined to save the other. An uplifting finish; was it worth the muck?

Did we say that all these plays are beautifully acted? They are. The clear light of a perfect art illumines them. But the tragedy of casting this glow over dung heaps!

REVIEWS

The Story of the World's Literature. By JOHN MACY. Illustrated by ONORIO RUOTULO. New York: Boni and Liveright. \$5.00.

Scarcely one of the innumerable "outlines" of science, literature, history, civilization and so on, that have oppressed the world in these recent years has been acceptable to Catholic readers. Most of these books have been defiantly hostile to Catholic beliefs and attitudes. They have made us despair of ever receiving fair or intelligent treatment in "outlines." It is with surprise, then, and with pleasure that one reads Mr. Macy's volume. While he does not tell his story precisely in the way that a Catholic would, he does tell it in such a manner that Catholics have few legitimate causes for complaint and many reasons for commendation. In the opening sentence of his preface he states that his purpose is "to give an account of the books of the world that are of greatest importance to living people." This tremendous undertaking must be, as he says, "only a one-man view of a vast subject." Therein lies his justification against complaints of critics who are disappointed by his omissions and disgruntled by his proportions. Since no critics could agree wholly in the matter of selection and appraisal, Mr. Macy must be accepted as final arbiter in regard to his choices in his own book. In clear, simple style, he makes a survey of all the literatures of all periods of the world. Mr. Macy betrays his likes and dislikes in his gallery of writers; but he is not guilty of petty prejudices. His sincerity is apparent and his judgment is, for the most part, commendable. It is quite evident that he has no desire to stir up quarrels or to offend the sensibilities of anyone. One of the really interesting features of the work is the cleverness with which he relegates disputed questions to historians, theologians and "technical scholars." Several criticisms of the text might be made, for example the recommendation of Renan's "Life of Jesus" alone of all the books written about the New Testament, Swedenborg as the only interpreter of the "Apocalypse," and Gibbon's "Roman Empire" as the lone modern "masterpiece." Occasional sentences may need correction, such as that declaring that Paul "is second in importance only to Jesus." But the tone of the narrative in general is acceptable. The sixteen illustrations in color and the numerous drawings by Mr. Ruotulo, as well as the perfect artistry of the printing and binding increase the attractiveness of the volume.

F. X. T.

Factors in American History. By A. F. POLLARD. New York: The Macmillan Company. \$2.50.

The eight lectures contained in this volume, addressed to British audiences, are motivated by a desire to foster in English institutions interest in American history. In Professor Pollard's opinion its claims cannot be ignored whether as a means of liberal education or as a training in politics or in research, or as a stimulus alike to interest in humanity or the humanities. "If history is an explanation of things as they are, the importance of the history of the United States (to Englishmen) is sufficiently obvious." Further, English history without American history is one-sided, so is American without English; in addition, neither will be adequate "without the background of the medieval world from which both developed." Professor Pollard probably sees more of the British tradition in us than many of our people would care to admit. For him the colonists in the Revolution were but proving their loyalty to inherited English traditions of liberty. "The American people was not born in 1776; it merely asserted that it had attained its majority and was entitled to a natural and national inheritance." There are chapters on what he calls American conservatism, nationalism, imperialism and idealism. Though all will not agree with his interpretation of events, no one will accuse him of prejudice or unfairness. True there are occasional outcroppings of animus against Rome but they are harmless. American readers will probably approach the volume more sympathetically by reading the last chapter first.

W. I. L.

A Diplomat Looks at Europe. By RICHARD WASHBURN CHILD. New York: Duffield and Company. \$4.00.

It is quite likely that many Americans look upon diplomacy as a profession of deceit and are inclined to agree with the lady who once remarked to Mr. Child: "Of course all diplomats have to be more or less dishonest." Another rather popular conception of an ambassador's office portrays it as a sinecure, the social life with its round of pleasures constantly claiming precedence. It is with a view to correct these and similar notions that our ex-ambassador to Italy has written his delightful and highly instructive memoirs. A careful study of these recollections will generate the conviction that a diplomat's life, like a policeman's, is not always a happy one. A conscientious ambassador must learn quickly the difficult art of crowding into twenty-four the work of twice twenty-four hours a day. Commenting on the Genoa and Lausanne Conferences, at which Mr. Child was our chief representative, he argues strongly against the doctrine of "open covenants openly arrived at." It is, he claims, an impossible ideal in a practical workaday world; such a policy would often defeat its own avowed purpose and might very easily precipitate a crisis. What is done behind closed doors is of really vital significance, but rarely comes to the ears of the outside world. The reflections on the wine of irresponsibility that, according to Mr. Child, intoxicated the world, and on the widespread disgust among workmen themselves for modern industrialism, are well worth pondering over. Many readers, on closing the book, will probably find themselves in agreement with the European who said to the author: "The greatest asset of the world today is the detachment of the United States. All the rest of the big forces are isolated from freedom of balanced thought and free action. For pity's sake, do not join those who are thus isolated."

J. A. C.

Wives. By GAMALIEL BRADFORD. New York: Harper and Brothers. \$3.50.

Gamaliel Bradford is almost a fad and he deserves his popularity, but as the volumes pour from the press one wonders whether he is not yielding to the charm of a facile but fatal formula. But if you pick up one of them, you are a marked man; you will burn the midnight oil or say hard things about grasping corporations when the electric light company renders its monthly statement. Yet for some time I have been asking myself how much of the novelist there is in Mr. Bradford, and how much of the historian. "Wives" does not wholly lay my doubts. The essay on Lincoln's wife is a masterpiece. Every one who has studied Lincoln has reached his own conclusions, which are, in brief, that never were qualities and traits apparently so incompatible joined in one frail woman—and then he doubts that conclusion! He will be no wiser after reading Mr. Bradford who himself ventures only on tentative conclusions and ends by advising all and sundry to form their own final judgment. Mr. Bradford has, on the whole, painted an engaging portrait of Mrs. Benedict Arnold; his hand was less sure when he approached Theodosia Burr, Mrs. James Madison, Mrs. Jefferson Davis, Mrs. James Gillespie Blaine, and Mrs. Benjamin F. Butler.

P. L. B.

The Moral Standards of Democracy. By HENRY WILKES WRIGHT. New York: D. Appleton and Company. \$2.00.

"Democracy," Professor Wright tells us, "is the formulation in political terms of the ideal of human brotherhood." Democracy is here used in a very broad sense; as indicating the common bond of charity it is equally applicable to all forms of human association. But we can all share the professor's belief that as applied to civil society it could find its fullest realization in rightly-ordered political democracy. However this does not quite meet the author's thought, which is that only as democracy is community-wide has it anything to do with morality. For the only moral good is the universal social good, to which the good of the individual, as such, or of any narrow group is subordinate and therefore, in itself, non-moral. To maintain this all-embracing and constricting brotherhood he postulates, or at least approves of, a state that is

"to assume a more and more complete responsibility for the whole mental and moral life of its citizens." Paternalism cannot go much farther. Whether, in seeking to give body to his formal principle of morality, Professor Wright has succeeded, as he hopes, in fusing into a coherent whole elements taken from neo-idealism and from positivistic psychology, may well be left to the judgment of those who accept either of these philosophies: for the rest of us his problem is merely of academic interest. Suffice it here to indicate that the outcome of his reasoning is a refined naturalism whose saints, we must conclude, are socially-minded university professors, great inventors, artists, and other such élite; the poor, the weak, the unsuccessful, the untalented, the uncultured are moral, if at all, only in a very low degree. Withal, there is much that is admirable in this book; but the man who can find no place for God in his moral system and who denies our immortality cannot tell us what gives ultimate value to our lives, what constitutes the true dignity of human personality nor consequently what is the moral relation of the individual to society.

C. V. L.

BOOKS AND AUTHORS

Following the Trail.—California is one of the great tourist magnets for the world. To facilitate travel and sight-seeing there, Fremont Rider has edited a guide-book which is thoroughly up-to-date. "Rider's California" (Macmillan. \$5.00) is almost encyclopedic in the information it contains and while individual tastes may differ about certain points stressed and others omitted (as we ourselves missed the "Carmel" at Santa Clara and the magnificent church of St. Ignatius in San Francisco, both objects of interest to all Catholic tourists), withal, its genuine usefulness and practical value is unquestionable. The volume contains twenty-eight maps and plans.

Why editors encouraged Stella Benson to reprint the contents of "The Little World" (Macmillan. \$2.50) is hard to understand. Journalistic sketches are ordinarily ephemeral. These are particularly so and they touch but superficially the peoples and places of which they treat. An Englishwoman who "trips" through the States and the Orient, Mrs. Benson is interested with the bizarre rather than with the cultural, educative and humanizing elements that motive the best travelers. No doubt she has ability; she describes well and the style is sprightly. But her American sketches lack sympathy and one wonders whether, in places, there is question of fact or fiction.

Booklets and Pamphlets.—Veneration of Pope Pius X has not dwindled during the decade since his death. To his tomb in the crypt of St. Peter's come "the rich and the powerful, as well as the poor and the friendless" and "rumor has it that they do not ask in vain." So concludes the "Short Life of Pope Pius the Tenth" (Benziger. 35c), by F. A. Forbes. The story of the Pontiff is told in some detail and with loving enthusiasm.

For clear and interesting presentation of Catholic belief there are few who can equal Rev. O. R. Vassall-Philips, C.S.S.R. In a series of articles that appeared in the London *Universe* and are now reprinted in the booklet, "Tom Smith's Conversion" (Herder), Father Vassall-Philips carries on a conversation concerning such matters as the existence of God, the truth of the Catholic Church, the authority of the Pope. Smith is the representative young Englishman, somewhat intelligent and somewhat prejudiced against Catholics. Of course, a Mary O'Brien plays an important part in his ultimate conversion.

Among the recent publications of the Paulist Press are the five-cent pamphlets: "The Direct Route," "What the Catholic Church Is and What She Teaches," "Extreme Unction," "Credo," "St. Bartholomew's Day," "The Contemplative Life," "The Catholic Sick Room," "Marriage as a Job," and "Book of Litanies."

A useful manual for those who are privileged to attend ordinations is "The Ceremony of Ordination to Priesthood" (Kenedy. 35c). The prayers are given in Latin and English, in parallel columns; they are prefaced by brief explanations of the ceremonies.

Articles in periodicals, however valuable, are always difficult to

locate for future reference. This may have inspired the publishers of *Homiletic and Pastoral Review* to reissue certain more valuable papers contributed to their monthly. The reprints are published by Joseph F. Wagner, New York, at the price of 50 cents per copy. The six pamphlets that begin the series are: "Three Spiritistic Fallacies," "Petty Jealousy in the Rectory," "Does the Volstead Law Bind in Conscience?" "The Ideal Superior and the Ideal Subject," "Priests as Business Men," and "The Unwedded Mother." All of the articles are worth reprinting and should have a wide distribution.

Poetry in the Laboratory.—It is both wise and necessary to consult the past when forecasting the future. R. C. Trevelyan follows this course in attempting to answer the question "Is there a future for poetry?" in his contribution to the *Today and Tomorrow Series*, "Thamyris" (Dutton. \$1.00). Rightly, his first consideration is the change that has come over the poetic medium. In earlier days poetry was sung or intoned, now it is merely read, or at best spoken. Its primitive appeal was to the ear, its present is to eye and to the "unsensual ear." There is no indication that poetry will ever return to its former medium. In the discussion of technique, Mr. Trevelyan is of the opinion that there must be a definite and constant framework to which words are to be attached, that there must be some fixed basis underlying the transient irregularities; at the same time he urges experimentation in verse structure that looks to the development of newer and freer forms. He is particularly clear in his analysis of the traditional rhythms, first that of syllable counting and then that of stress. In the discussion of the future of "Poetic Material," he may very well be dogmatic so long as he confesses that he does not speak with certainty.

In a prefatory note to his "Poetic Values" (Macmillan. \$1.75), John G. Neihardt states that the lectures in the book were "prepared for a university audience." A close reading of the volume proves that this must be true, and that furthermore, no one but a university professor could have evolved the lectures. The theory of poetry is wrapped up in philosophic and psychological complexities and in intricacies of words and phrases. As a result, there is but a minimum of discussion of poetic values and a lengthy commentary on Oriental and Occidental philosophic conceptions, on the materialistic psychoses of society and the like.

Our Modern Ills.—So widespread and so insidious is the propaganda in favor of the limited family that young people can scarcely avoid hearing it and, unless fortified, considering it. "The Bride's Boudoir" (New York: Siebel. \$2.00), by Miriam Ryon, a pseudonym, is an exhortation in favor of motherhood. In a series of letters and jottings from a diary, an innocent young girl confesses the thoughts that came to her during her brief period of engagement and her first year of marriage. The reactions towards dress and social life that occupy the earlier phases of her growth dwindle before the great temptation of her wedded inexperience. By an accident she is saved. The ecstatic joy that resulted from her observance of God's law was sufficient earthly reward. Happily, her young husband was the sober, decent type that appreciates old-fashioned virtue and a home. The parable is sentimental and based wholly on natural motives; but it might serve as an antidote to the vapid, fallacious arguments spread abroad by the misguided enthusiasts who are blindly trying to destroy society.

In an editorial comment AMERICA has already pointed out the serious errors of Judge Lindsey's latest book "The Revolt of Modern Youth" (Boni and Liveright. \$3.00). No doubt, the Judge's intentions are beyond question; but what can be said of the social physician who in easier divorce, dissemination of the knowledge of contraceptive methods, and an indulgent view of certain other forms of sex-excess, finds a remedy for the evils which surround our young people? It does not seem too much to say that this is only another form of a very old folly which consists in curing vice by calling it virtue.

Possession. The Great World. Quest. The Vatican Swindle. Closed All Night. Summer.

Since most of the characters that one meets in the pages of "Possession" (Stokes. \$2.50), by Louis Bromfield, are unpleasant, one can hardly be blamed for tiring of their company long before their final bow. This would be true even if the novel were cut down, as it should be, two-thirds of its present length. The story is that of a girl's struggle to rise from obscurity in a factory town to the heights of fame in the musical world. The theme is well developed, perhaps over-much developed in detail. Ellen Tolliver is determined to "possess" herself despite the exactions of a mother, of the town, of two husbands, of a baby, as well as the allurements of a public career. One regrets that so much good writing has been wasted on worthless people.

"A Gentleman with a Duster" is not unknown as the portraitist of contemporaries and the appraiser of current British politics. He has become a novelist in "The Great World" (Doran. \$2.00). The early scenes take place before the death of Gladstone, the concluding events are in our present years. The main thread of the narrative is the succession of three dukes: the sharp-tongued, kindly old man who wanted to outlive Gladstone, the slow-witted grandson whose tastes were of the farm, and the young incumbent who was being primed for public life. Surrounding these is a colorful group of diverse people. The significance of the book comes from its comments on the state of England, its present dangers, its strength, and its vague future. Its purpose is an appeal to patriotism.

The growth and development of two cousins, differing widely in character and temperament as well as in home surroundings, make up the story of "Quest" (Houghton, Mifflin. \$2.00), by Katherine Newlin Burt. The exposition is too voluminous for the plot. The object of the young men's quest is not always clearly defined, though the author states from time to time that it is God. The ideas of God that they finally conceive are sufficiently nebulous. Yet the story is interesting. The study of the processes and reactions of the child mind given in the earlier chapters is particularly illuminating.

Under the lurid title of "The Vatican Swindle" (Knopf. \$2.50), Dorothy Bussy has translated the pre-war story, "Les Caves du Vatican," by André Gide. The core of the action is the rumor that the true Pope had been secretly imprisoned by the Freemasons and that an impersonator had been set up in his place. Through the complications and plots that resulted, M. Gide finds full scope for his social satire and his theories on criminality. It is a perverse book, though delicately written.

Surface brilliancies are the only commendable features in "Closed All Night" (Seltzer. \$2.00), translated from the French of Paul Morand. In these four experiences there is no plot, no complication, little real character study. There is merely anecdote, useless observations and words. The central figure on whom the phrases are hung is in each case an abnormality; one is an explosive Irish poet, another a bloodless German scientist, the third a passionate French politician and the last an impertinent Indian beauty doctor. Always the characters are sensual, hardened and hypocritical.

More serious than the two last named books, and perhaps for that reason more noxious is "Summer" (Holt. \$2.50), the second English volume of Romain Rolland's series of novels that are grouped under the title of "The Soul Enchanted." Annette and Sylvie, the young girls in the first volume, are still contrasted. But Annette's struggle against poverty, her fierce passion for her son, her rejection of several suitors are the dominant themes in this latest story. This novel is a study of womanhood, just as "Jean-Christophe" was an analysis of the male. M. Rolland is definitely opposed to the Christian code of morals and to religion. His work is praised as being objective and detached; but it is patent propaganda, in favor of an unmoral set of principles that would bring the world into chaos. The preaching is done with art and subtlety.

Communications

The editors are not responsible for opinions expressed in this department

Catholic Girls in Secular Colleges

To the Editor of AMERICA:

For some reason or other I had intended to discontinue AMERICA. Having been a subscriber to your magazine for many years, it seemed I would not get used to its new "dress." But AMERICA of December 19, 1925, has changed my plans. I now feel once more that I cannot afford to miss its contents. Your articles, "Catholic Girls in Secular Colleges" and "A Catholic Foundation Unmasked," have caused my change of mind. Reading the speech of Mother Joseph in the *Daily American Tribune* of Dubuque, I wondered if her words would go unchallenged. Thanks for your courageous words! They will put new "pep" in many a simple priest who is fighting for the Catholic school. Keep up courage. The fight is only beginning. It is not so much the good, God-fearing, simple Catholics who need to be instructed, but those who are "higher up" in society and look down with disdain on our schools and what they stand for. May AMERICA never become a "pussy-footer" or a "mollycoddler" but remain the champion of the truth.

Wisconsin.

R. O.

Lighthouses on the Great Lakes

To the Editor of AMERICA:

In the last issue I noticed a letter in regard to the Lighthouse on the Great Lakes. There is in Detroit a Mr. W. H. Law, who is a minister of some non-Catholic church and who, to the writer's knowledge, has been doing this work for twenty years on the Great Lakes. He has stated he comes across many Catholic people in his journeys. He has a small boat in which he goes from one lighthouse to the other and no doubt he does a great deal of good work.

He claims he does not teach them any tenets, merely tries to entertain them and moralize the necessity of leading good lives.

The writer saw a very fine letter of recommendation for his work from the late Archbishop Ireland. As Mr. Law is about seventy-five years old the chances are his time for doing this work is very limited and it is a matter in regard to which great good could be done if it were taken up. The various dioceses from Duluth to Buffalo would be the ones to take it up if anything could be done.

Detroit.

J. A. ROE.

"Prohibition, Popery and Pop!"

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Once upon a time I fancied that the most unimaginable combination in the world would be a friendly base-ball game between the Ku Klux Klan and the Knights of Columbus with a negro for umpire and the proceeds to go to the Jewish Home for Desperate Children. But this fancy pales shame-facedly into nothingness beside the latest product of the Prohibition mind.

In the vagaries of my riotous fancy I might have imagined Henry Ford making a donation to B'nai B'rith or the fearfully solid South voting solidly for Al Smith. But never in the wildest saltations of my intellect have I dared even to juxtapose the antipodal concepts of Prohibition and the Papacy. You may then easily imagine the feelings with which I read in the *London Daily News* for December 5 the startling announcement that the United Group of Prohibition Societies had addressed an appeal to Pope Pius XI to secure his moral support for the Prohibition laws.

I am completely gravelled. An appeal from the erstwhile omnipotent Anti-Saloon League and of all places to the Vatican! What can have happened when this, the self-created, self-sufficient champion of virtue, this unconscionable guardian of law, which turned the withering blasts of its displeasure on Presidents, priests,

and publicans alike, now crawls to the throne of Peter yawping for help?

Whatever the reasons for this turn towards Rome, of one thing I am certain—that there must be a Jesuit at the bottom of the whole affair. It is the only orthodox conclusion to reach. Jesuits are always at the bottom of anything otherwise inexplicable. As the English say, "it's a rum go."

In any case, if the Prohibitionists are bent on this rapprochement with Rome, let them well consider the step they are taking. Can the religion of Prohibition, a creed conceived and brought forth in Methodism and Baptistry, have aught to do with Rome?

And here obtrudes itself the most important question of all. Will the Pope hearken to the appeal of the Prohibitionists? Aye, there's the rub! Secondly, supposing he does favor their request. Will he not demand a *quid pro quo*? And what more logical than that he should stipulate the election of Al Smith as President—that unspeakable henchman of still more unspeakable Tammany! O, my brethren, then shall we sound the depths of misery unplumbed and be ground beneath the iron heel of Rome.

If the contemplation of this dire disaster should not suffice to turn our Prohibitionists from their mad plan, let them give ear to the following consideration. The Church of Rome from its very beginning has been likened to a leaven or ferment which spread everywhere and fermented everything it touched. And its Founder was known to have changed water into wine—for beverage purposes. Do our friends need any more evidence than this? Nay, I can see them recoil in horror, I can hear them cry resolutely, "Never! Never!"

But the difficulty is easily solved. The cry once was "Rum, Romanism and Rebellion!" Being a one-hundred-per-cent American, let me now suggest the new slogan: "Prohibition, Popery and Pop!" Armed with this shibboleth, O, Crusader of the Soft Drink and Hard Word! fearlessly fare forth in your pursuit of other people's liberty and happiness, singing the battle cry of Popery and Pop.

Hastings, England.

F. A. M.

The Laity and the Liturgy.

To the Editor of AMERICA:

May I, as an ordinary layman, express a few thoughts in regard to the liturgy and the missal?

There seems to be of late much earnest enthusiasm concerning the study of the liturgy and of the using of liturgical prayer among lay people. Students in many of our Catholic schools and colleges are taking, along with the regular course of studies, a liturgical course.

A genuine study of the liturgy will eventually lead them to a real and lasting appreciation of all that is beautiful and soul-inspiring in Catholic worship; and that is worship according to the thought and heart of the Church.

Mother Church allows a wide range in regard to how her children shall pray, and among the many beautiful and helpful devotions great freedom is granted to all. But when the Great Sacrifice is offered, the central act of our holy religion, it seems to me that there should be more general harmony among the laity in assisting thereat.

Christ is the Victim of the Sacrifice, and all hearts and minds should turn towards that great action. Could Catholics unite on this liturgical movement it would be far more important than any literary movement thus far undertaken in America.

Yonkers, N. Y.

JOHN W. BURKE.

The Puritan Cash Christmas

To the Editor of AMERICA:

The present spirit of our American Christmas has inspired me to indite an extempore Christmas Carol, which does not harmonize with the chorus of the Christmas Carol of Commerce whose notes are dollar marks. The music of the Christmas bells is minstrelsy to me, but the modern ear has become accustomed to a Commercial

Carol which mistakes the sordid word *Cash* for the sweet word *Christ*.

I well understand it would need more than the genius of Dickens to restore the celebration of Christmas to "normalcy." Dickens would attempt it, however, were he with us in the flesh, for his protest was against the puritanical somberness and gloom which hung, like dark palls, over the counting-house and business exchange of his day. He did not intend that Christmas should become "good business."

But even Dickens did not see the soul of Christmas, its spiritual being, and today we are crammed by the crowd into the glistening golden webs of speculative spiders. We do our Christmas shopping early—and late. The gift is the thing! And so we buy ourselves poor in our efforts to supply the myriad mankind we have perhaps merely met in the past, dealing out to them cost-marked "tokens of love" from Woonsocket to Walla Walla.

This is not the spiritual spirit of Christmas. The gift goes, but the giver gathers in the returns at home. Appraising the accumulation on Christmas day, he remembers the mortgage and forgets those *friends* until Advent again advances.

The true spirit of Christmas exists where Christ lives in us. It delights in changing sadness into gladness, in welcoming the worn and weary, bringing pleasures to the poor, and making cheerful the children about us—and we all are children. Earnest tokens of love, in accord with this spirit, will be the fruit of our recognition of its presence.

Christmas is essentially the Feast of Humility, when a God became Man for poor wretched mortals, and an outcast among men at that. We need, therefore, to approach the Christmas counter with humility, even as we should be humble when we hasten to the Christmas church. A sort of snobishness is surely, in part, the cause of our cruel cash Christmas. It were better that

Empty we go, and ill be-dight,
Singing "Noel" on a Winter's night,

than that we be quaffing from Uncle Tobias's tumblers, sent in exchange for a pearl-set peace-pipe whose purchase caused the forfeiture of our Ford.

Washington.

FRANK A. ANTHONY

Who Pays the Gas Bill?

To the Editor of AMERICA:

Mr. Martin S. Kaveny in "Who pays the Gas Bill," in the issue of AMERICA for December 5, makes several sweeping statements that are not founded on fact, and are unjust to those men and women who by the millions have invested their savings in the securities of the electric light and power industry. Because I know from a short lifetime of observation and experience that they are wrong, I feel constrained to challenge them.

We are told that during the past four years public authorities have been opposing persistent demands for ever increasing rates for light, heat and power and that all these charges have increased about thirty per cent. In his last paragraph he also states in effect that after twenty years of attempted State supervision we are no further along than when we started and that the regulatory bodies were unable to reduce the rates when it was necessary.

I would call attention here to a simple graph compiled from official figures of the Department of Commerce and Labor, an important branch of that same Government of which Mr. Kaveny was "an expert." These curves show, more convincingly than I can state, how unfair is Mr. Kaveny's statement relative to an increase of thirty per cent. A more accurate statement would be that these electric light and power rates have decreased thirty per cent. If Mr. Kaveny is not familiar with this chart, which has been used extensively in several national advertising campaigns, I commend it to his serious study, for it contains a wealth of information for one who unquestionably is always interested in facts.

It is further to be noted, in connection with Mr. Kaveny's

last statement, that the basic theory back of governmental supervision of public utilities is that rates shall obtain that are fair and reasonable, and shall bring to the utility a reasonable return on the property used for and useful in public service. This does not essentially preclude any question of increasing rates where necessary any more than it does the reduction when warranted.

Emporium, Pa.

C. A. WHITEMAN

To the Editor of AMERICA:

I have read the communication of Mr. C. A. Whiteman relative to his objections to some of my statements. Apart from presenting a graph prepared for advertising purposes, on behalf of electric companies, in which a curve of price unit of sales is compared with a curve representing the general increase in the cost of living, he submits no other proof for his positive declarations.

The writer had completed an extended study on electric companies supplying power and light to the public, and intended to give the benefit of this to the readers later, and for this reason, did not stress the high cost to consumers by corporations above mentioned.

The electric industry in the last ten years has been completely revolutionized and a chart which shows merely a curve reflecting the charge per unit to the consumer, and omits the curve showing the enormous decrease in the cost of production per unit, has no probative force.

Briefly, the electric light and power companies, because of the great improvement in equipment and large economies practised, together with the great increase in the sales of current, which continue to grow constantly, could reduce their charge to the public from twenty-five to thirty-five per cent.

The output of central stations, given by the United States Census, increased from 2,506,800,000 kilowatt hours in 1902, to 38,288,300,000 kilowatt hours in 1922. The *Electric World*, January 5, 1924, estimates the output for 1933 will be 126,000,000,000 kilowatt hours.

Where formerly five pounds of coal were necessary for the generation of a kilowatt hour, now 1-9/10 pounds of coal is all that is required per kilowatt hour. Many power plants generate power that extends into other States, thereby eliminating millions of dollars formerly used for plant and equipment. An examination of recent financial statements of a number of electric companies indicate that their profits mount as high as forty per cent on the investment; an unconscionable return thereon.

Does it appear that there has been sufficient regulation of these companies by the State Commissions?

The City of New York has already initiated litigation to decrease the rates of electricity in the City of New York. Thirty-three companies in New York State have recognized the overcharge and decreased their rates slightly to consumers. In the face of these facts, does it seem like an injustice to the investors or, conversely, is it an imposition on the public?

The writer further agrees that the rates shall be fair and reasonable and shall secure a reasonable return on property used and useful. But to extend the application of this principle to the public streets of a city, and to include leased property in a valuation for a rate base, because these properties are used, is carrying the application of "property used and useful" entirely too far.

There is no intention on the part of the writer to disparage the great progress going on in the electric industry, especially in its effort to develop giant power, but he insists that the public, as well as holders of capital, shall participate in these benefits and that rates shall be decreased when the cost of production decreases.

To quote the foremost leader on the public side, a Governor of a great commonwealth, in connection with this gigantic electrical development, we must be careful that "we shall not be the helpless servants of the most widespread, far-reaching and penetrating monopoly ever known. Either we must control electric power or its masters and owners will control us."

New York.

MARTIN S. KAVENY.